

**PUBLIC HEARING****Professional Conduct Committee  
Initial Hearing****7 – 22 July 2025****Name:** RAHMAN, Yasir Samee**Registration number:** 76339**Case number:** CAS-203534-F7K4Q1

---

**General Dental Council:** Ms Louise Culleton, Counsel.  
Instructed by Clare Elam Cooke, IHLPS**Registrant:** Present  
Represented by Mr Stephen Brassington, Counsel.  
Instructed by MDDUS

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of misconduct**Outcome:** Suspension (with a review)**Duration:** Six Months**Immediate order:** Immediate suspension order

---

**Committee members:** Anthony Mole (Lay) (Chair)  
Gill Jones (Dentist)  
Clare McIlwaine (Dental Care Professional)**Legal adviser:** Paul Moulder**Committee Secretary:** Jenny Hazell  
Andrew Keeling (for afternoon of 22 July 2025 only)

**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.**

The Charge against Yasir Samee Ur Rahman, a dentist, BDS University of Manchester 1999 is as follows:

That being a registered dentist:

1. Between 2020 and January 2023, whilst working at [IN PRIVATE] ("The Practice"), you made comments of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature, including:
  - (a) Telling female colleagues that you had had an affair, and that the affair:
    - (i) Was with an 18-year-old;
    - (ii) Took place at a previous practice you worked at;
    - (iii) Took place over a few years;
    - (iv) Involved you receiving oral sex.
  - (b) In, or around November 2022, responding to seeing your female colleague Witness A out of her uniform by saying words to the effect that she "*had a great figure*";
  - (c) In or around November 2022, when shown a picture of what your colleague Witness A was planning to wear at the Practice's Christmas party, stated "*if that's what you're wearing I'll definitely be attending*" or words to that effect;
  - (d) On or around 5 December 2022, saying to your female colleague, Witness D, words to the effect that "*school uniforms are sexy*";
  - (e) Asking one or more of your female colleagues (including Witness A and/or Witness D and/or Witness G) questions about their sex life;
  - (f) In or around May to June 2021, remarking to your female colleague Witness D that a female patient had "*a nice bum*";
  - (g) In or around October to November 2022, during an interaction with your female colleague Witness G you said to her words to the effect of:
    - (i) "*Come sit on my knee and call me uncle*";
    - (ii) "*I've got my rape eye on for you*".
  - (h) In or around October to November 2022, you described to your female colleague Witness D the interaction set out at 1(g), saying words to the effect that:
    - (i) You went "*full perve mode*";
    - (ii) You asked Witness G to sit on your knee and refer to you as "*uncle*";

- (iii) You told Witness G that you would have an affair with her.
  - (i) In or around August 2021, telling your female colleague Witness D that she *"looked better bigger"* or words to that effect;
  - (j) In or around August 2021, telling your female colleague Witness D the names of female colleagues with whom you would have sex;
  - (k) Telling your female colleague Witness G words to the effect that you had *"made a list"* of female nurses who were *"pretty or not"*;
  - (l) In or around July 2021, stating to your female colleague Witness D words to the effect that it was *"a shame"* that a female patient had *"a pretty face but such a small chest"*;
  - (m) Saying to your female colleague Witness G that she was *"off limits"* because she was around the same age as your youngest child or words to that effect;
  - (n) During the summer of 2022, having remarked to one or more female colleagues (including Witness G) that you slept naked, and having received a reply indicating that they considered that to be *"disgusting"*, you retorted with words to the effect that: *"You wouldn't be saying that if I sent you dick pictures"*;
  - (o) When speaking with your female colleague Witness H, you referred to another female colleague and said words to the effect of *"I would like to bend her over a dental chair"*;
  - (p) Told Witness A that you had a *"ranking system"* and spoke about who out of the dental nurses you would *"shag"* or words to that effect.
2. Between February 2017 and January 2023, whilst working at the Practice, you made comments of an inappropriate and/or discriminatory nature, including:
- (a) Between March 2021 and January 2023 disparaging your colleague Witness A's level of education;
  - (b) On or around 5 December 2022 saying that female victims of sexual abuse are to blame depending on their choice of clothing or words to that effect;
  - (c) Between January 2021 and January 2023 saying to your female colleague Witness C - *"What are you doing changing a lightbulb? You should be in the kitchen"* or words to that effect;
  - (d) In or around May to June 2021, saying to female colleague Witness D, in front of a patient, that she *"should be in kitchen because its where women belong"* or words to that effect;

- (e) In or around December 2022, saying to junior female colleague Witness G that she should be “*cleaning dishes and crumbs off counters*”, or words to that effect;
  - (f) In or around August 2022, having treated a male patient who was black stating to Witness D words to the effect that:
    - (i) If your daughter “*ever came home with a black man*” you would “*pour acid over her*”;
    - (ii) “*Brown and black people don’t like each other*”.
  - (g) Between January 2021 and January 2023 you said to a male colleague, The Practice Manager, words to the effect of “*I hate gays but I like you*”.
3. Whilst working at the Practice, you made comments of an inappropriate nature, within the hearing of a Patient, Patient A, in that:
- (a) On or around 17 December 2022 (after the Practice’s Christmas party) you entered Witness C’s surgery room where G was present and
    - (i) [IN PRIVATE];
    - (ii) referred to colleague E having worn a dress that was too short.
4. Between November and December 2022, you made inappropriate physical contact with female colleagues at the Practice, including by:
- (a) Rubbing Witness A’s arms up and down on one or more occasions, including one on or around 5 December 2022;
  - (b) In or around November 2022, knowing that Witness D did not like to be hugged, you grabbed her from behind to hug her.
5. Between 2021 and January 2023, whilst working at the Practice, you failed to treat patients with kindness and compassion, including by:
- (a) In or around September 2022, responding to a patient’s request not to be laid back in the chair due to vertigo by saying words to the effect that you were “*not going to break [your] back for her*”, before then trying to lay her back in the chair despite her request;
  - (b) In or around September 2022, telling a patient, who was a retired nurse, that you “*hated all nurses as they killed your mother*” or words to that effect;
  - (c) Responded to an elderly female patient’s comment that she was doing well for her age by saying words to the effect that you had seen a lot of people her age doing a lot better than she was;
  - (d) Responded to a young female patient’s comment that she missed her last appointment due to having a lot going on by saying words to the effect that the deposit money from her missed appointment would go towards paying for your

car.

6. Your conduct as alleged at 1 (a), (b), (c), (e), (g), (i), (j), (k), (n), (o), (p) and 4 (a) and (b) above was sexually motivated.

AND that by reason of the matters alleged above your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT AND PRELIMINARY MATTERS**

1. This hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee ('the Committee') was convened for the purposes of an inquiry into a Charge against you, which was set out in the notification of hearing.
2. You are present at this hearing and are represented by Mr Brassington, Counsel. Ms Culleton, Counsel, appears on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC).
3. At the outset of the hearing Ms Culleton made an application under Rule 18 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006* ('the Rules') to amend the Charges as set out below as follows:

The stem of 3 – Delete the words "Between 2021 and January 2023" and amend the Charge to read: "Whilst working at [REDACTED] you made comments of an inappropriate nature within the hearing of a Patient, Patient A, in that:"

Charge 3(a) – amend to read "On or around 17 December 2022 ... "

The stem of 2 – delete '2014' and amend the Charge to read "Between February 2017 and January 2023 ...."

Charge 2(a) insert the words "Between March 2021 and January 2023" before the word "Disparaging"

Charge 2(b) – insert the words "On or around 5 December 2022" before the word "Saying"

Charge 2(g) – insert the words "Between January 2021 and January 2023" before the word "Saying"

4. In respect of the stem of 3, the application was made so as to better particularise what is said to have occurred. In respect of the other proposed amendments, this was to particularise the date range set out in the Charges in line with the date when the relevant witnesses started employment at the Practice (as set out in their witness statements).

5. Mr Brassington indicated that he had no objection to the GDC's application. He also invited the Committee to consider amending Charge 2(c) to include the date range of "Between January 2021 and January 2023", which was in line with Witness C's evidence, as well as the stem of Charge 2 to read "Between February 2017 and January 2023". Ms

Culleton confirmed that she was in agreement to the two amendments proposed by Mr Brassington.

6. The Committee considered the submissions of both Counsel. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee reminded itself of the provisions of Rule 18 which states:

*“(1) At any stage before making their findings of fact in accordance with rule 19, a Practice Committee may amend the Charge set out in the notification of hearing unless, having regard to the merits of the case and the fairness of the proceedings, the required amendment cannot be made without injustice...”*

7. The Committee was satisfied that the proposed amendments, which in essence particularise the dates as to when the alleged incidents are said to have occurred, can be made without injustice. It therefore acceded to the GDC’s application under Rule 18.

### **Decision on application for special measures**

8. Ms Culleton made an application under Rule 56 for Witness D, who was attending the hearing in person, to give her oral evidence from behind a screen. Ms Culleton referred the Committee to Rule 56(1)(e), which states that a Committee may treat the following as a vulnerable witness *“any witness, where the subject matter of the hearing is of a sexual nature and the witness was the alleged victim.”* Ms Culleton submitted that Witness D fell into this category and should therefore be afforded special measures. Mr Brassington, on your behalf, did not oppose the application.

9. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

10. The Committee was satisfied that Witness D is a vulnerable witness within the meaning of Rule 56(1) (e) and that measures were necessary for the Committee to receive her evidence. It therefore acceded to the GDC’s application for Witness D to give her oral evidence from behind a screen.

### **Summary of the case**

11. Ms Culleton outlined the background to the GDC’s case. You were employed full time at the Practice in April 2022 until January 2023. In summary, between 2020 and January 2023 while you were practising as a dentist at the Practice several female colleagues raised concerns about your conduct. This included concerns that you made comments of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature (Charge 1) towards female colleagues, including asking questions about one or more of your female colleagues’ sex lives; between February 2017 and January 2023 you made comments of an inappropriate and/or discriminatory nature (Charge 2); you made comments of an inappropriate nature within the hearing of a patient, Patient A (Charge 3) on or around 17 December 2022; between November and December 2022 you made inappropriate physical contact with two female colleagues (Charge 4); between 2021 and January 2023 you failed to treat patients on four separate occasions with kindness and compassion (Charge 5).

12. Furthermore, the GDC alleges that your conduct in relation to some of the matters alleged in Charges 1 and 4 are sexually motivated (Charge 6). Ms Culleton referred the Committee to the case of *Basson v GMC* [2018] EWHC 505 (Admin) where it was said that sexual motivation was conduct done either in the pursuit of sexual gratification or in the pursuit of a future sexual relationship, or both. It was also open to the Committee to find that the comments alleged at charge 1 were inappropriate and/or sexual nature.

13. Matters came to a head after the Practice Christmas party on 3 December 2022. You did not attend the Practice Christmas party. Photographs from the party were put onto a Practice WhatsApp group chat with multiple members of staff. One of the photographs showed Witness G wearing a short dress. She was sitting down and her underwear was visible from the angle of the photograph.

14. On 5 December 2022, whilst working with Witness D in the surgery, you had a conversation with her about the content of the photograph of Witness G. During the course of that conversation, [IN PRIVATE]. Witness D alleged that you made comments to her which she found distressing, she became upset and left the surgery. At some point after this event took place Witness D shared her concerns about you with the Practice Manager, Witness I, and Witness A.

15. You had a further conversation with Witness D in which you apologised for upsetting her.

16. Witness D sent an email to Witness I on 15 December 2022 in which she set out her reasons for not wanting to work with you anymore.

17. In December 2022 the Practice carried out an investigation (the Investigation) into the concerns, led by Witness F. He interviewed several members of staff, including Witness A, Witness C, Witness D, Witness G and Witness H.

18. You were invited to interview on 16 January 2023. In that interview you gave an explanation on a number of the matters alleged against you. You sent a letter of resignation dated 20 January 2023 to Witness I.

19. In April 2023 Witness D submitted a written complaint to the GDC.

### **Admissions**

20. At the outset Mr Brassington indicated that you admitted Charges 1(b), 1(c), 2(c), 3(a)(i), 4(a) and 5(c) as matters of fact. However, you do not admit the stem of the charges in relation to these matters. The Committee, having received advice from the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of Rule 17(4), noted the factual admissions but decided not to announce that the connected allegations were proven given that the stem of each of these facts has not been admitted.

### **Evidence**

21. The Committee considered all the evidence before it, both documentary and oral. The factual evidence provided to the Committee by the GDC comprised signed witness



statements along with associated exhibits (including, for some of the witnesses, the contemporaneous handwritten notes of the investigation) from the following witnesses:

- Witness D (statement dated 29 November 2024)
- Witness A (dated 28 November 2024)
- Witness I (dated 22 November 2024)
- Witness H (dated 26 November 2024)
- Witness C (dated 18 December 2024)
- Witness G (dated 17 January 2025)
- Patient A's statement (dated 5 January 2025) as well as her email of complaint to the Practice dated 19 December 2022.

22. In addition, the Committee heard oral evidence from Witnesses H, D, G, C, A and Patient A. All of these witnesses gave their evidence remotely, with the exception of Witness D, who attended the hearing in person.

23. Witness F provided a witness statement to the GDC dated 3 December 2024. Ms Culleton advised the Committee that the statement (which had been redacted) set out Witness F's involvement in the internal investigation that was carried out in December 2022 – January 2023 and it had been agreed by all parties that he was not required for this hearing.

24. Witness I provided a witness statement to the GDC dated 22 November 2024. The statement set out how the initial concerns were raised about you following him starting in his role as the manager of the Practice in the latter half of December 2022. Witness I also set out that he spoke to you about Witness D's concerns. He set out that the Practice carried out an investigation into the concerns raised. He was not involved in the investigation. The Committee has been informed that Witness I's statement has been agreed by both parties and therefore they did not require Witness I to give evidence.

25. The Committee exercised its discretion under Rule 57(1) and was satisfied that it was appropriate to receive the evidence of Witness I. It decided that it was not necessary to hear from Witness I given that the statement was agreed by both parties and it had no questions for this witness.

26. The Committee also had regard to the evidence presented on your behalf. This included your signed witness statement dated 4 July 2025 and your signed supplementary statement dated 8 July 2025. It had regard to your oral evidence which you gave under oath before the Committee. In summary, you accepted some of the facts alleged against you but you denied all of the Charges.

27. In addition, the Committee had regard to your interview notes of the investigation dated 16 January 2025.

28. The Committee has been provided with a bundle containing 10 testimonials. Several of the authors of these testimonials confirm that they knew you at the material times and speak positively as to your general character, with no reported concerns. The remaining



authors of the testimonials are from colleagues who have known you since the events in question.

### **Findings of Fact**

29. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it, both documentary and oral. It took account of the submissions on the alleged facts made by both parties. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It has borne in mind that you are of good character with no previous fitness to practise history or findings against you.

30. The Committee considered the factual charges 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.

31. In respect of Charge 6, that your conduct in relation to some of the matters alleged in Charge 1 and Charge 4 are sexually motivated, the Committee has applied the test set out in the case of *Basson v GMC* [2018] EWHC 505 (Admin).

32. The Committee made the following findings:

1	Between 2020 and January 2023, whilst working at (“the Practice”), you made comments of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature, including:
1a.	Telling female colleagues that you had had an affair and that the affair
1ai	<p>Was with an 18-year-old;</p> <p><b><i>Found proved insofar as it relates to inappropriate (not sexual nature)</i></b></p> <p>In reaching its decision, the Committee had regard to the evidence of Witness D, Witness A, Witness C and Witness G.</p> <p>Witness D’s evidence was that “<i>Once [Witness A] had left the room the Registrant told me that he’d love to have an affair with her. It was then that the Registrant informed me of an affair he had with a nurse at a previous practice. He asked me if I thought the age gap between an 18-year-old man a male in his 40s was grooming and I said yes.</i>” Witness D also referred to you having had an affair in the notes of the Practice’s Internal investigation dated 21 December 2022. She confirmed that the content of her witness statement to the GDC was true.</p> <p>Witness A’s evidence was that sometime in 2022 you spoke to her about an affair you had had with an 18 year old at a previous practice. The notes of her interview dated 21 December 2022 as part of the Practice’s investigation state: “<i>Bragged all the time about the affair. ... He said I had an affair with a Nurse out of no [sic] where.</i>”</p> <p>Witness A was consistent in her evidence that you told her that you had had an affair.</p>

Witness C's evidence was that during her interview as part of the Practice's investigation she raised that you told her that you had an affair at a previous practice that you worked at. She described you as being "*open*" about it. The interview note dated 21 December 2022 of the Practice's Investigation state "*Past affairs with other nurses.*"

Witness C accepted that there had been gossip in the Practice about you having had an affair with a female colleague. However, Witness C was clear in her evidence that you told her that you had had an affair and that the experience had made you appreciate your wife and realise what you had.

Witness G's evidence was that "*The Registrant also told us [other nurses] about an affair he had at a practice he was previously employed at but I don't know the name of the practice.*" When cross-examined about this point, Witness G maintained that you openly discussed in the Practice that you had had an affair.

You denied making these comments and suggest that staff at the Practice believed that you were having an affair with your previous dental nurse and that this was the reason why you left the previous practice. You explained that you had been working for the company for over 10 years and unfortunately the rumours persisted. You say that you always denied any truth to the gossip and explained why it started.

The Committee has found Witness D, Witness A, Witness C and Witness G's evidence on this charge to be consistent – each of them provided their own different account of the context in which you volunteered the information that you had had an affair with a female colleague. Witnesses D and A were also clear in their recollection that you told them that the affair was with an 18-year-old.

The Committee accepts that not all of the witnesses in support of this charge have mentioned the affair during the Practice Investigation. However, it considers that the absence of this information in their interviews does not render their evidence unreliable, given that they were answering questions regarding various concerns about your conduct. Furthermore, the Committee considers that given that the accounts provided by Witnesses D, A, C and G are slightly different in themselves supports its view that their evidence was not contaminated.

As part of its findings of facts, the Committee considered the submission made on your behalf that some of the evidence from some of the witnesses in this case may be undermined due to collusion between them and/or contamination. Some of the witnesses accepted that the alleged concerns were discussed between staff at the Practice at the time. Further, Witness A was present at the interviews during the investigation.

The Committee rejected the suggestion that the witnesses may have colluded for a number of reasons. Firstly, it noted that although the experiences of the

	<p>witnesses in relation to your conduct and behaviour were thematically similar, there were differences in their accounts which were reflected in the statements which they provided to the Practice as part of its internal investigation which took place soon after the events in question are said to have taken place. The content of these statements was consistent with the accounts set out in their statements to the GDC. Furthermore, Witness A and Witness D each submitted contemporaneous complaints to Witness I in advance of the investigation; the contents of these complaints were broadly consistent with the accounts they provided to the Practice and in their witness statements to the GDC. In addition, the Committee found no clear evidence of motive for collusion.</p> <p>The Committee acknowledged the positive testimonials from previous workplace colleagues. However, the Committee gave limited weight to the testimonials since they do not relate to your behaviour at this particular practice at the material time.</p> <p>The Committee preferred the evidence of Witnesses D, A, C and G. Accordingly, the Committee finds this charge proved. It also finds that the comment you made was inappropriate but not of a sexual nature for the reasons set out at 1.a.ii below.</p>
1a.ii	<p>Took place at a previous practice you worked at <b><i>Found proved insofar as it relates to inappropriate (not sexual nature)</i></b></p> <p>Witnesses D, A, C and G each confirmed in their evidence that you told them that you had had an affair at a previous practice.</p> <p>The Committee accepted the evidence of the witnesses as in Charge 1.a.i and accordingly found this charge proved for the same reasons.</p> <p>In respect of the comments being made at 1a.i and ii), the Committee considered that it was inappropriate for you to have told your female colleagues that you had had an affair with an 18-year-old at a previous practice. In the Committee's view, this was sensitive information which you openly shared with your female colleagues and it was not an appropriate topic of conversation in a professional environment. It considers that the comments you made went too far in a professional environment. The Committee has also borne in mind the power imbalance between you in the senior position of a dentist, having discussions with colleagues in a junior role.</p> <p>However, the Committee did not find that the comments you made in themselves were sexual in nature given that the findings did not relate to the specific details of the affair.</p>
1a. iii	<p>Took place over a few years <b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p>

	<p>The stem of Charge 1(a) alleges you telling female colleagues that you had had an affair (this charge requires that you told more than one female colleague that you had had an affair and the affair took place over a few years). However, the evidence in support of this charge comes from one witness - Witness A. Her evidence was that you spoke to her about having had an affair over a few years. Witnesses D, C and G make no mention of the length of the affair in their statements. Accordingly, the Committee was not satisfied that this charge has been proved to the requisite standard.</p>
1a. iv	<p>Involved you receiving oral sex <b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p> <p>The stem of Charge 1(a) alleges you telling female colleagues that you had had an affair. This Charge requires that you told more than one female colleague that the affair involved you receiving oral sex. However, the evidence in support of this charge is that of one witness - Witness A. She set out in her witness statement that you told her that you were given “<i>blow jobs</i>”. In the absence of any other witnesses in support of this charge, the Committee is not satisfied that this Charge has been proved to the requisite standard.</p>
1b.	<p>In, or around November 2022, responding to seeing your female colleague Witness A out of her uniform by saying words to the effect that she “<i>had a great figure</i>”; <b><i>Found proved insofar as it relates to inappropriate (not sexual nature)</i></b></p> <p>Witness A’s evidence was that during one day in 2022 when she was wearing her non-work clothes you told her that she had a great figure. Witness A confirmed in her oral evidence that you repeatedly made comments about her figure that day. She described the incident as having taken place in the reception area and that your comment made her feel “<i>uncomfortable</i>.”</p> <p>Witness A sent a letter of complaint about your behaviour to Witness I in which she cites a number of comments you have said to her, including “<i>comments about my figure</i>”.</p> <p>You agreed this insofar as you made a comment about Witness A’s appearance in the context of dieting and weight loss and you did not tell her she had a great figure.</p> <p>The Committee considered that you attempted to paint a more positive picture as to the context in which this comment is said to have taken place. However, you denied making the specific comment about Witness A’s figure. The Committee preferred Witness A’s evidence on this point. Whilst she accepted there was some conversation around health and weight, she was clear that you had repeatedly made comments about her figure in this particular conversation.</p> <p>The Committee found Witness A to be an open and straightforward witness</p>

	<p>who gave her evidence without embellishment.</p> <p>The Committee was satisfied that it was inappropriate for you to have made a comment to Witness A about her figure in a professional environment. The Committee noted Witness A's evidence that she was not comfortable with the comment. You accepted that it was not appropriate for you to have commented on Witness A's appearance at all.</p> <p>However, the Committee was not satisfied that the comment and the context in which it was said was sexual in nature. Witness A's evidence was that whilst she felt uncomfortable by the comment you had made, she did not consider it to be a sexual comment.</p>
1c.	<p>In or around November 2022, when shown a picture of what your colleague Witness A was planning to wear at the Practice's Christmas party, stated "<i>if that's what you're wearing I'll definitely be attending</i>" or words to that effect; <b>Found proved insofar as it relates to inappropriate (not sexual nature)</b></p> <p>In her evidence Witness A accepted that she showed you a picture of what she would be wearing to the Practice's Christmas party during a conversation with her colleagues in the professional setting. Her evidence was that you said to her "<i>If that's what you're wearing I'll definitely be attending.</i>"</p> <p>Witness A described the way in which you responded made her feel "<i>uneasy</i>". Witness A's interview notes of the Practice Investigation dated 21 December 2022 state: "<i>He [you] said Oh I will Def be coming now said let me have a look</i>" which was consistent with Witness A's evidence.</p> <p>You accepted what is set out factually in the charge. You explained that you were asked your opinion of Witness A's dress at your workstation in the surgery where there was a group of nurses congregated. You say that you responded in a "<i>humorous manner</i>" that you would be attending the Christmas Party.</p> <p>The Committee reminded itself of its finding in relation to charge 1(b). It considered there was relevant similarity with that charge and you had a propensity to make inappropriate comments towards your female colleagues about their appearance. The Committee accepted Witness A's evidence. It considered the comment to be inappropriate in that it was a personal comment about Witness A's appearance which was not an appropriate comment between professional colleagues. In the circumstances in which it was made, there was nothing to suggest that it was made in a sexual manner.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds this charge proved.</p>
1d.	<p>On or around 5 December 2022, saying to your female colleague, Witness D, words to the effect that "<i>school uniforms are sexy</i>"; <b>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</b></p>



Witness D set out in her witness statement a conversation that took place between you and her on 5 December 2022 whilst you were sitting alone in the surgery. This was in relation to the photograph of Witness G at the Christmas Party held on 3 December 2022 which had been shown on the Practice's Whatsapp group.

[IN PRIVATE] She then set out that at this point she started crying and walked out of the surgery. Witness D's evidence was that she became upset, left the room and then she spoke to Witness A about everything that had been said to her in the surgery at that time by you.

Witness D was interviewed on 21 December 2022 about this incident at the Practice Investigation on this matter. The notes record: [" IN PRIVATE "] It further states that Witness D walked out of the room and that another nurse could see she was upset.

Witness D accepted in her oral evidence that she had not included this specific comment in her written complaint to the Practice. She explained that she had omitted some details of other matters relating to the comment you made to her.

Witness A corroborated Witness D's evidence that Witness D spoke to her about the comments you made to her about "*school uniforms being sexy*". She maintained this position in her evidence.

Your evidence is that you explained that you explained to Witness D that "*some sick men find school uniforms are sexy*" [IN PRIVATE].

The Committee considered Witness D's evidence on this matter, as set out in her witness statement, her complaint letter to the Practice and her interview at the Practice Investigation. It noted that whilst this specific comment was not included in Witness D's complaint letter to the Practice, the letter was submitted by Witness D with broad reasons as to why she did not wish to work with you again. The Committee noted, however, that Witness D did include that you repeatedly made "*vulgar comments*". The Committee further noted Witness D clarified the comment "*school uniforms are seen as sexy*" in her interview at the Practice Investigation. In her oral evidence Witness D clarified that the comment "*school uniforms are seen as sexy*" recorded in the Practice interview note was incorrect.

It was put to Witness D that you said to her "*some sick men out there find school uniforms are sexy*". She refuted this suggestion. Notwithstanding the slight difference in the record of interview and Witness D's witness statement and her oral evidence, the Committee found her evidence credible. The words attributed to you, either in the record of interview, or in Witness D's evidence, are very different to your account. Witness D was adamant that you had not stated the words as you suggested to her. Notwithstanding the slight difference in the record and in Witness D's account, the Committee was satisfied that Witness D was credible.



	<p>The Committee is satisfied that saying to a female colleague word to the effect that “<i>school uniforms are sexy</i>” is clearly inappropriate. It is further satisfied that the comment is of a sexual nature in that it sexualises minors.</p> <p>The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
1e.	<p>Asking one or more of your female colleagues (including Witness A and/or Witness D and/or Witness G) questions about their sex life; <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>In reaching its decision the Committee had regard to the evidence of Witnesses A, D and G.</p> <p>Witness A, in her [undated] letter of complaint, set out that you asked “<i>Questions about my sex life and another nurse who was in the surgery with us at the time.</i>” <i>Witness A’s interview notes dated 21 December 2022 record that you asked her: “If I have a good sex life and if her partner makes her orgasm.”</i></p> <p>Witness D’s evidence was that “<i>On multiple occasions the Registrant would ask me personal questions about my sex life. The Registrant asked me if my partner could make me orgasm and if I spoke</i>”. In her oral evidence Witness D maintained that you asked personal questions about her sex life.</p> <p>Witness D also stated in the Practice Investigation interview that you asked a staff member “<i>whether her boyfriend made her orgasm</i>”.</p> <p>Witness G’s evidence was that “<i>on a Saturday towards the end of 2021 when it was just the nurses and the Registrant, he would ask us questions about sexual experiences.</i>”</p> <p>You denied asking colleagues any “<i>explicit</i>” questions about their sex lives.</p> <p>The Committee found Witnesses A, D and G’s evidence reliable on this charge. It was satisfied that it was you who initiated the topic of their sex lives. The Committee noted that three witnesses were clear in their recollection of the type of comments you would ask about their sex lives – including whether their individual partners made them orgasm. It accepted their evidence.</p> <p>The Committee considered the risk of the contamination of the witnesses’ evidence. It did not find any evidence that the witnesses had colluded in their evidence for the reasons set out above. Having heard from the witnesses, the Committee was satisfied that they were referring to separate occasions when they had been subjected to questioning by you about their sex lives and there was no contamination.</p> <p>The Committee concluded that it was inappropriate for you to have asked female colleagues about their sex lives in a professional environment. It also</p>



	<p>considered you asking female colleagues about their sex lives, including asking them whether their partners made them orgasm, is clearly sexual in nature.</p> <p>The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
1f.	<p>In or around May to June 2021, remarking to your female colleague Witness D that a female patient had “a nice bum”; <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness D’s evidence was that during the month of June 2021 you commented on a patient’s physical appearance stating: “<i>she’s got a nice bum.</i>” In her oral evidence Witness D explained that you mumbled the comment to her as the patient left the room. Witness D accepted that she did not report the matter at the time.</p> <p>You denied the charge and contend that you have not and would not make such a statement about any of your patients.</p> <p>The Committee found Witness D’s evidence on this charge to be credible. It has borne in mind its finding at Charge 1(b) - that you made an inappropriate comment about Witness A’s physical appearance and considers that there is a propensity in you to make comments towards female colleagues about the physical appearance of females.</p> <p>The Committee was satisfied that the comment you made about a patient’s appearance, regardless of whether it was heard by the patient, was inappropriate. The Committee was also satisfied, on the evidence before it, that referring to a patient having a “<i>nice bum</i>” has a sexual undertone and was therefore sexual in nature.</p> <p>The Committee found this charge proved.</p>
1g.	<p>In or around October to November 2022, during an interaction with your female colleague Witness G you said to her words to the effect of:</p>
1g.i & 1.g.ii	<p>“Come sit on my knee and call me uncle”; “I’ve got my rape eye on for you”. <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness G’s evidence was that sometime in October or November 2022 she was in one of the surgeries with Witness A. She recollected that you said to her “[<i>Witness G</i>] <i>come and sit on my knee and call me uncle</i>” and “<i>I’ve got my rape eye on for you</i>”.</p> <p>In Witness G’s complaint to the Practice she stated “<i>he’s asked me to sit on his knee and call him uncle. And he told me he’s got his rape eyes on</i>”.</p>

	<p>Witness G stated in the Practice’s Investigation dated 19 December 2022 “<i>Sit on my knee and call me uncle and told me he’d got his rape eyes on</i>”. Further to this, Witness G was interviewed on 22 December 2022 and on the same subject, she stated “<i>In a weird way, he said call me uncle. Said this in the surgery. He sat down, call me uncle and sit on my knee.</i>”</p> <p>Witness G maintained her position in her oral evidence.</p> <p>Witness A’s evidence was that she heard about this incident but she did not observe the incident in question. She confirmed this position in her oral evidence.</p> <p>Your evidence was that Witness G came to you for advice as she was not happy. You told Witness G that she should consider you as an uncle and could talk to you about her problems. You accepted that this may have been paternal condescension and “<i>on reflection I have ought to have kept interactions professional.</i>”</p> <p>The Committee bore in mind that there were some slight differences in the wording of the comments “<i>I’ve got my rape eyes on</i>” and “<i>I’ve got my rape eye on for you</i>”. However, the Committee was satisfied, given the context of this comment, that the comments you made were materially the same and that they were directed to Witness G.</p> <p>The Committee also took into account the inconsistency in Witness G’s evidence that Witness A observed the incident whereas Witness A’s evidence was that she had no recollection of observing it. Nevertheless, it found Witness G’s evidence to be reliable on the key aspect of the Charge.</p> <p>The Committee was satisfied that the comment you made to Witness G was inappropriate and sexual in nature. You were inviting Witness G to have physical contact with you by sitting on your knee. The comment regarding “<i>rape eye</i>” is also sexual in content. Witness G describes feeling uncomfortable and being “<i>lured in</i>” by you. The Committee found the Charges proved.</p>
1h.	<p>In or around October to November 2022, you described to your female colleague Witness D the interaction set out at 1(g), saying words to the effect that:</p>
1h.i – 1.hii	<p>You went “<i>full perve mode</i>”; You asked Witness G to sit on your knee and refer to you as “<i>uncle</i>”; <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness D’s evidence was that during November Witness G was working as a dental nurse with you. Witness D recollected that when she went into the Practice the day after you had been working with Witness G, you told her [Witness D] that you thought you had upset Witness G. Witness D recollected that you told Witness G to sit on your knee and call you uncle. Witness G said</p>

	<p>you said to her that you went on “<i>full perve mode</i>.” She recollected telling you that you needed to apologise to Witness G.</p> <p>Witness D referred to this incident in her complaint to Witness I where you recorded “<i>told me he went full ‘perve mode’ on another member of staff the previous working day, informed me he asked her to sit on his knee, refer to him as uncle...</i>”</p> <p>Witness D further referred to this incident in the Practice investigation where the notes record “<i>Yaz said I have gone pedo [sic] mode on [Witness G]</i>” and further explained that you told [Witness G] “<i>to sit on your knee call me Uncle</i>”.</p> <p>In Witness D’s oral evidence she maintained her position on what you had said and clarified that her statement was incorrect and the most accurate word you had used was recorded in her interview at the Practice investigation in which she stated you had gone “<i>pedo [sic] mode</i>” and not “<i>perve mode</i>” as recorded in her statement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the correction of the term “<i>pedo</i>”, the Committee considered that Witness D provided a reliable account of your conversation with her concerning your interaction with Witness G. Witness D’s evidence was supported by her complaint and in her interview in the Practice Investigation. Accordingly, it finds this Charge proved.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that the comment you made to Witness D about the interaction that took place with Witness G was inappropriate and sexual in nature for similar reasons in relation to Charge 1(g)(i).</p> <p>The Committee found the Charges proved.</p>
1h.iii	<p>You told Witness G that you would have an affair with her. <b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p> <p>The GDC relies on the evidence of Witness D in support of this charge.</p> <p>Witness G has given no evidence to suggest that you said to her that you would have an affair with her.</p> <p>Witness D’s evidence was during the interaction with Witness G, as outlined at Charges 1hi and 1hii, you said you would have an affair with Witness G.</p> <p>In the absence of any direct evidence that you told Witness G directly to her that you would have an affair with her, the Committee was not satisfied that this Charge has been proved to the requisite standard. The Committee found the Charge not proved.</p>
1i.	<p>In or around August 2021, telling your female colleague Witness D that she “looked better bigger” or words to that effect; <b><i>Found proved insofar as it relates to inappropriate (not sexual nature)</i></b></p>

	<p>Witness D's evidence was that during the month of August 2021 she had lost a lot of weight and that on one occasion you made a comment of how you looked "<i>better bigger</i>". She described how you proceeded to show you pictures of "<i>bigger women</i>" on your computer at work.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that there is no mention of this comment in Witness D's written complaint or the notes of her interview dated 21 December 2022. However, the Committee considered that the absence of any reference to the comment by Witness D at an earlier stage in the proceedings did not necessarily undermine her credibility on this charge. In coming to this view, the Committee noted that whilst this specific comment was not included in Witness D's complaint letter to the Practice, the letter was submitted by Witness D with broad reasons as to why she did not wish to nurse for you again. Further, the questions addressed to Witness D in her Practice Investigation interview were generally focused on the incident on 5 December 2022 and included areas of her initial complaint.</p> <p>You denied this allegation. You explained that there was a conversation around this subject but you denied using the words. You also explained that there was constant chatter about diet and weight at the Practice.</p> <p>The Committee had already found that you have a propensity to make inappropriate comments about the physical appearance of females in the context of a professional environment and took this into account. The Committee accepted the evidence of Witness D on this matter. It is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that you said to her that she looked "<i>better bigger</i>" or words to that effect.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that it was inappropriate for you to have made comments about a colleague's physical appearance in the context of a professional environment. You were in a position of authority as a dentist and therefore there was a power balance between you and Witness D. However, it is not satisfied that the comment you made was sexual in nature, rather than being an inappropriate comment on a person's physical appearance.</p> <p>The Committee found the Charge proved in respect of inappropriate comment.</p>
1j.	<p>In or around August 2021, telling your female colleague Witness D the names of female colleagues with whom you would have sex; <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness D's evidence was that you detailed the names of female colleagues from the practice with whom you would sleep with.</p> <p>In Witness D's complaint she set out that you had told her which members of staff you would have sex with. In the Practice Investigation notes dated 21 December 2022 she recites the names of the 'top five nurses' with whom you</p>

	<p>would sex.</p> <p>You denied this Charge and maintained that you did not have these discussions.</p> <p>The Committee has already found that you have made comments of a sexual nature towards Witness G and asked your female colleagues about their sex lives. The Committee considered that you had a propensity to initiate inappropriate sexual conversations with female colleagues and took this into account. It found Witness D's evidence to be consistent and reliable on this matter.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that it was inappropriate for you to have a conversation of this nature with another member of staff. In the Committee's judgement, telling a colleague the names of female colleagues with whom you would have sex with is sexual in nature. The Committee therefore found the Charge proved.</p>
1k.	<p>Telling your female colleague Witness G words to the effect that you had <i>"made a list"</i> of female nurses who were <i>"pretty or not"</i>; <b>Found not proved</b></p> <p>The GDC relies primarily on the evidence of Witness G in support of this charge. Witness G's evidence was that you had told her that you only wanted to work with specific nurses and that you made a list of nurses who were pretty or not and with whom you wanted to work. She explained that you told her this when she was working at reception.</p> <p>Witness G also stated that if she was a good nurse, you would work with her and that if not, you would not want to work with her.</p> <p>In her written complaint to Witness I Witness G refers to you ranking your nurses <i>"in order of appearance"</i>.</p> <p>You denied this and explained that you had a preference for working with nurses who were better at their job.</p> <p>The Committee considered that Witness G appeared to conflate your desire to work with competent nurses with their appearance. The Committee is not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that there is sufficient evidence to find this charge proved. Accordingly, it found the Charge not proved.</p>
1l.	<p>In or around July 2021, stating to your female colleague Witness D words to the effect that it was <i>"a shame"</i> that a female patient had <i>"a pretty face but such a small chest"</i>; <b>Found proved insofar as it relates to inappropriate (not sexual nature)</b></p> <p>Witness D's evidence was that around July 2022 she brought a friend of hers into the Practice. She recollected that once her friend had left the surgery you</p>

	<p>said to Witness D <i>"It's a shame that she has a pretty face but such a small chest."</i></p> <p>Witness D also referred to this matter in her complaint to Witness I and in her interview on 21 December 2022 as part of the Practice's Investigation.</p> <p>You denied this allegation.</p> <p>The Committee reminded itself of its finding in relation to charge 1(b). It considered there was relevant similarity with that charge and you had a propensity to make inappropriate comments towards your female colleagues about their appearance. The Committee accepted Witness D's evidence. It considered the comment to be inappropriate in that it was a personal comment about a patient's appearance which was not an appropriate comment. In the circumstances in which it was made, there was nothing to suggest that it was made in a sexual manner. The Committee found the Charge proved in respect of inappropriate comment.</p>
1m.	<p>Saying to your female colleague Witness G that she was <i>"off limits"</i> because she was around the same age as your youngest child or words to that effect; <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness G's evidence was that on one occasion you said to her that she was "off limits" to you because she was the same age as your youngest child. She maintained this position in her oral evidence. Witness G also stated your comment that she was "off limits" made her feel safe. She maintained this position in her oral evidence.</p> <p>Witness G raised this matter in her complaint in which she stated: <i>"Told me I'm off limits to him as I'm the same age as his youngest child."</i> She also referred to it in her interview on 21 December 2022 as part of the Practice's investigation.</p> <p>You denied this Charge.</p> <p>The Committee accepted Witness G's evidence on this Charge. It found Witness G to be a straightforward witness who maintained her position in her oral evidence. In addition, the Committee found her comment to feeling <i>"safe"</i> was impactive in terms of her credibility.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that it was inappropriate for you to have made this comment to Witness G. It considers that the expression <i>"off limits"</i> suggests that you were implying to Witness G that you could have a sexual relationship if she was older therefore it was sexually in nature.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this Charge proved.</p>
1n.	<p>During the summer of 2022, having remarked to one or more female colleagues (including Witness G) that you slept naked, and having received</p>



	<p>a reply indicating that they considered that to be “<i>disgusting</i>”, you retorted with words to the effect that: “<i>You wouldn’t be saying that if I sent you dick pictures</i>”;</p> <p><b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness G’s evidence was that during the summer of 2022, when it was very hot, she was having a general conversation with you at the bottom of the stairs next to the reception area. She recollected that you told her that you did not sleep well because it was too hot. Witness G asked you if you slept with a fan on, to which you replied that you slept naked. Witness G recollected that she replied by saying “<i>Ew disgusting</i>” and that Witness B also reacted in the same way. Witness G’s evidence was that “<i>You wouldn’t be saying that if I sent you dick pictures.</i>”</p> <p>Witness G referred to this incident in similar terms in her complaint to Witness I. She also referred to this incident in similar terms in the notes of her interview on 21 December 2022 as part of the Practice’s Investigation.</p> <p>You denied this allegation and also explained that you did not know what the term “<i>dick pics</i>” meant.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that Witness B, who is said to have been the other person who witnessed this event, is not a witness of fact in this case.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Committee considers that Witness G has been consistent in her evidence on this charge. It has accepted her evidence.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that the comment you made was inappropriate. It is further satisfied that the comment was sexual in nature given that you introduced the topic of sending ‘<i>dick pictures</i>’ to at least one female colleague. This was in the context of a conversation that began about not being able to sleep in the hot weather which escalated into you introducing comments about sending photographs of your sexual organs to female colleagues.</p> <p>The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
10.	<p>When speaking with your female colleague Witness H, you referred to another female colleague and said words to the effect of “<i>I would like to bend her over a dental chair</i>”;</p> <p><b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p> <p>The GDC relied on the evidence of Witness H in support of this Charge. Witness H referred to a conversation about a previous female Practice Manager between you and her just after lockdown. You were both stood outside the Practice. Witness H’s evidence was that you commented that you missed the previous female Practice Manager and you said to Witness H: “<i>I would like to bend her over a dental chair.</i>”</p>



	<p>The notes of the Practice Investigation dated 21 December 2022 record that Witness H was also asked if there was anything else she wanted to raise, to which her response was “no”. In her oral evidence Witness H accepted that she did not mention this matter when interviewed at the Practice Investigation because she was not asked about it.</p> <p>You denied the Charge.</p> <p>The Committee considered that had you said the comment alleged at Charge 1(o) to Witness H, it would have been memorable to her at the time of the Practice’s Investigation. The Committee noted that Witness H was unable to give further details in their oral evidence in relation to this Charge. In the absence of any other evidence in support of this matter, the Committee is not satisfied on the balance of probabilities, that this charge is proved. The Committee found the Charge not proved.</p>
1p.	<p>Told Witness A that you had a “<i>ranking system</i>” and spoke about who out of the dental nurses you would “<i>shag</i>” or words to that effect.</p> <p><b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and sexual nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness A’s evidence was that you made comments about how you ranked the nurses in the Practice. Witness A also set out in her complaint that you stated which members of staff you would have sex with. In the Practice’s Investigation dated 21 December 2022 Witness A provided the names of the three nurses with whom you said to her you would “<i>shag</i>”.</p> <p>You deny this Charge. Your evidence was that the only time you told Witness A about any preference with regards to dental nurses was when Witness A invited you to state which nurses you would prefer to work with as she was making the staff rota. You claim your comments were based on their clinical abilities only.</p> <p>As set out above in Charge 1.j, the Committee considered that you had a propensity to initiate inappropriate sexual conversations with female colleagues and took this into account. The Committee found Witness A’s evidence to be straightforward, clear and consistent with the earlier comments she made at the time of the Practice’s Investigation. The Committee preferred the evidence of Witness A.</p> <p>The Committee considers that making comments about having a ranking system and speaking about which dental nurse you would “<i>shag</i>” was inappropriate and sexual in nature. The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
2.	<p>Between February 2017 and January 2023, whilst working at the Practice you made comments of an inappropriate and/or discriminatory nature, including:</p>
2a.	<p>Between March 2021 and January 2023 disparaging your colleague Witness A’s level of education</p> <p><b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p>

	<p>Witness A's evidence was that you made personal comments about her lack of education. She maintained this position during her oral evidence.</p> <p>Witness A set out in her complaint that you made derogatory comments about her lack of education. In response to a question about this at the Practice's Investigation dated 21 December 2022 Witness A stated: "<i>No reason he said why I shouldn't have a good education and says the same to patients between having GCSE + A levels.</i>"</p> <p>You explained that you might have conversations with patients who were students, about their education, but you do not recall having a conversation with Witness A about her level of education. You also explained that you were not aware of her level of education and could not comment on it.</p> <p>Witness A's evidence was not that you directly criticised her level of education. Rather, it was an inference from your general comments about education. Her statement to the investigation refers to a discussion about having a good education, whereas in her oral evidence Witness A said that she felt that you were criticising her.</p> <p>The Committee is not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that it can safely infer that you made disparaging comments to Witness A about the level of her education. Accordingly, it found this Charge not proved.</p>
2b.	<p>On or around 5 December 2022 saying that female victims of sexual abuse are to blame depending on their choice of clothing or words to that effect <b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and discriminatory nature</i></b></p> <p>[IN PRIVATE]. Her evidence was that you also made comments to Witness D about Witness G wearing a short dress, stating that women should not dress like that and that it is their own fault if something happens to them when they are wearing short dresses. Witness A explained that as soon as Witness D informed about her this matter, she went to talk to Witness I.</p> <p>Witness D's evidence was that on or around 5 December 2022 during the course of a conversation with you, you said to her: "<i>So if a woman's wearing something revealing, not looking after her self-respect then a man isn't responsible for his actions towards her; it's the woman's fault not the man's ...</i>". Witness D also referred to this incident in her written complaint to Witness I.</p> <p>In your evidence you accepted that the conversation took place with Witness D regarding the photograph of Witness G and that in retrospect it was a mistake to have had that conversation. You explained that a person has a right to dress whichever they please, whether they wish to wear a revealing dress or a headscarf and face veil, but that there may be consequences of their choice.</p>

	<p>The Committee has accepted Witness A's evidence and that of Witness D, who were both very clear as to the content of the conversation. On your explanation of events you maintained that there may be consequences for a female if they choose to wear certain types of clothing.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that the comment that you made to Witness D was inappropriate and discriminatory. The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
2c.	<p>Between January 2021 and January 2023 saying to your female colleague Witness C - <i>"What are you doing changing a lightbulb? You should be in the kitchen"</i> or words to that effect</p> <p><b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and discriminatory nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness C's evidence was that she was in the Practice kitchen, telling a story about changing a light bulb whilst standing in a bath of a water. She recollected that you overheard the comment and you said to Witness C: <i>"What are you doing changing a lightbulb? You should be in the kitchen."</i> She stated in her witness statement: <i>"I thought it was a bit cheeky of the Registrant to say that"</i>.</p> <p>You accepted that you made the comment to Witness C and that it was an <i>"unfortunate remark"</i> but was not said in a serious manner.</p> <p>The Committee accepts Witness C's evidence on this matter and is satisfied that you made the comment to her. It is satisfied that the comment made was inappropriate and you also accept this.</p> <p>The Committee is further satisfied that the comment was discriminatory towards a female colleague given that it implies that the place for a woman should be in a kitchen. The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
2d.	<p>In or around May to June 2021, saying to female colleague Witness D, in front of a patient, that she <i>"should be in kitchen because it's where women belong"</i> or words to that effect;</p> <p><b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and discriminatory nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness D recollected that on one occasion when she mixing alginate, which was like mixing batter for a cake, you said to her that she should be in the kitchen because <i>"it's where women belong"</i>. She explained that you made this comment in front of a patient within the surgery who was an elderly gentleman. Witness D's account of this event is broadly similar to how she described it in the notes of the Practice Investigation dated 21 December 2022. In that statement she said <i>"He said in front of a male patient mixing alginate you should get back in the kitchen where you belong as alginate had set."</i> Witness D refuted the suggestion that you said to her words to the effect that <i>"mixing alginate is a bit like mixing cake."</i></p>

	<p>You accepted your explanation was an ill-considered and inappropriate remark to make. However, you denied the words set out in the Charge.</p> <p>The Committee has accepted Witness D's evidence on this charge. Witness D maintained her position in her oral evidence and was clear and consistent. The Committee preferred Witness D's evidence to your explanation.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that the comment was inappropriate. It is further satisfied that the comment was discriminatory towards women since it insinuated that women belong in the kitchen. The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
2e.	<p>In or around December 2022, saying to junior female colleague Witness G that she should be "<i>cleaning dishes and crumbs off counters</i>", or words to that effect;</p> <p><b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and discriminatory nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness G's evidence was that "<i>During the investigation in December 2022, I remember a day in the Practice when [Witness H] came to me for help with restarting her computer. There were two switches, one for the building and one for the computer. I switched the wrong switch which was the one for the building and the Registrant stormed over to me saying that I should be cleaning dishes upstairs and crumbs off the counter.</i>" She maintained this position in her oral evidence.</p> <p>You say that you recollect the incident but that you did not say the words alleged against you. You recollect telling Witness G that since she was not qualified or authorised to repair electrical equipment at the Practice and it was a job for the facilities and maintenance department, her time would be better spent tidying the staff room. You recollect pointing out the message on the Practice WhatsApp group that morning about the kitchen/staff room having been left messy. You suggested to Witness G that her time would be better spent on that. Witness G did not accept your version of events and maintained that what you said to her was that alleged in the Charge.</p> <p>Witness G's evidence as set out in her witness statement is consistent with her complaint to the Practice in which she states "<i>Was helping the TCO move some wiring for the service. Yasir stated I should be in the kitchen washing up and cleaning up crumbs.</i>"</p> <p>The Committee has had regard to the account given by Witness G in her first interview at the Practice investigation dated 19 December 2022 in which she states: "<i>in the afternoon he made comments about how I should be in the kitchen cleaning up pots and moving crumbs. At the time I was in the TCO room helping [named person] move some wires.</i>" The Committee notes that this account is broadly similar to the account given by Witness G in her second interview at the Practice investigation dated 21 December 2022. In that account she refers to you telling her that she should be upstairs picking</p>

	<p>up the crumbs and cleaning the counter.</p> <p>The Committee accepted Witness G's evidence, which it found to be consistent and reliable on this Charge, and preferred her explanation.</p> <p>The Committee considers that the comment was inappropriate in that it suggested that a female colleague should be cleaning dishes and crumbs off counters. This was clearly discriminatory towards women. The Committee found the Charge proved.</p>
2f.	<p>In or around August 2022, having treated a male patient who was black stating to Witness D words to the effect that:</p>
2f.i.	<p>If your daughter <i>"ever came home with a black man"</i> you would <i>"pour acid over her"</i>;</p> <p><b><i>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and discriminatory nature</i></b></p> <p>Witness D recollects that during August 2022 a patient came into the surgery for a bridge to be fitted. She describes the patient as being male and black. Her recollection is that after the patient had left the room you said to her that if your daughter ever came home with a black man that you would pour acid over her. Witness D set out that she reported the matter to then Practice Manager but the matter was not taken forward. Witness D accepted that she had not raised this particular episode in her complaint to the Practice. However, she had raised it in her statement in the Practice investigation dated 21 December 2022. The notes record <i>"Patient [initials]. Fitting Pt Bridge. In August when she was leaving if his daughter came home with [sic] black man would pour acid on her. Face. I spoke to [initials] previous manager who replied that's what Yaz is like."</i></p> <p>You strongly deny making these comments and contend that you would never harm your daughter in any way. You suggest that honour killings and mutilation are Islamophobic tropes, which were being repeated in an attempt to smear you.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that Witness D did not include this incident in her written complaint to the Practice, which she accepted in her oral evidence. It has also borne in mind that there are no other witnesses in support in this charge.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Committee considered that Witness D was straightforward and very clear and consistent with the account she provided at the Practice Investigation in December 2022. In addition, it found no evidence that Witness D was prejudiced or attempted to smear to you.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that the comment made was inappropriate and discriminatory in nature in that it shows a prejudice towards black men.</p>

	Accordingly, the Committee found this Charge proved.
2f.ii	<p><i>"Brown and black people don't like each other".</i>  <b>Found proved both in relation to inappropriate and discriminatory nature</b></p> <p>Witness D's evidence in her witness statement to the GDC was that during the course of the conversation regarding the male patient (Charge 2f.i above) you went on to state <i>"brown and black people don't like each other."</i></p> <p>You denied this charge.</p> <p>The Committee noted that Witness D did not include this particular comment in her complaint or in the Practice Investigation. The Committee found that Witness D was very clear in her oral evidence regarding this comment and the surrounding circumstances. The Committee found that Witness D's evidence was straightforward and credible. It preferred her evidence to your evidence and accordingly finds this Charge proved.</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that the comment made was inappropriate and discriminatory in nature. Accordingly, it finds this Charge proved.</p>
2.g.	<p>Between January 2021 and January 2023 you said to a male colleague, the Practice Manager, words to the effect of <i>"I hate gays but I like you"</i>.  <b>Found not proved</b></p> <p>The GDC relies on the evidence of Witness H who overheard the conversation. Her evidence is that she overheard a conversation between you and the previous Practice Manager while she was on reception. Her evidence is that you said to the previous Practice Manager that you <i>"did not like patients who were gay but that you liked him"</i>.</p> <p>The Practice Investigation notes for Witness H dated 21 December 2022 record <i>"I heard him say to [name of practice manager] previous PM I hate gays but I like you."</i></p> <p>You denied this charge and your evidence is that the conversation arose when you were talking about cultural norms and your religion. You stated that this conversation had been overheard incorrectly.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that the conversation was only overheard by Witness H and that she was unable to provide any details as to its context and content. There is no evidence from the previous practice manager who was party to the conversation. The Committee considers that Witness H could have misheard the conversation. The evidence is weak in support of this charge. Accordingly, the Committee is not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that this Charge is proved. The Committee found this Charge not proved.</p>



3.	Whilst working at the Practice you made comments of an inappropriate nature, within the hearing of a Patient, Patient A, in that:
3.a	On or around 17 December 2022 (after the Practice's Christmas party) you entered Witness C's surgery room where G was present and
3.a.i	<p><b>[IN PRIVATE];</b>  <b><i>Found proved in relation to inappropriate</i></b></p> <p>Witness G refers to a conversation that took place between you and her on or around 17 December 2022 following the Practice's Christmas party. Witness G was working with Witness C at the time when this conversation took place. <b>[IN PRIVATE]</b>. She describes feeling uncomfortable about the conversation and that in the end Witness C asked you to leave the room.</p> <p>Witness C also refers to a conversation that took place in your surgery between Witness G and yourself. She describes you coming into her surgery to speak to Witness G about the allegations made about you. <b>[IN PRIVATE]</b>. Witness C's evidence was after you left the room Witness G was in tears and that Witness C tried to calm her down.</p> <p>Witness C also recollected that her next patient, Patient A, came into the surgery and said that she heard the conversation through the wall.</p> <p>Patient A's evidence was that she was waiting in the waiting room upstairs on 17 December 2022. She describes how you came up the stairs and went into the surgery and shut the door. She recollected overhearing certain words spoken by you and describes your voice as sounding very loud.</p> <p><b>[IN PRIVATE]</b>. However, you contend that the statement has been taken out of context.</p> <p>The Committee considered Witness G's account to be clear, consistent and reliable. Furthermore, her account is supported by that of Witness C, who also was also present at this conversation.</p> <p><b>[IN PRIVATE]</b>. In fact, the conversation had been overheard by a patient.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds this charge proved.</p>
3.a.ii	<p>referred to colleague E having worn a dress that was too short.  <b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p> <p>Witness C's evidence was that during the course of the conversation you went on to discuss another colleague [Colleague E] and the way she dressed, stating that her dress was too short. Witness C maintained this position in her oral evidence.</p> <p>Witness C's evidence on this point was broadly consistent with the account</p>



	<p>she gave in the Practice Investigation interview in which she states “<i>said [Colleague E] had a short dress on. Seen photos of the x-mas party.</i>”</p> <p>Witness G’s evidence was that you warned her about the dress she was wearing at the Christmas party because you did not want anything to happen to her. However, there is no mention in Witness G’s statement about you having referred to Colleague E having worn a dress that was too short. In her oral evidence Witness G accepted that she was upset but she did recall you referring to another colleague wearing a short dress but no reference to the dress being “<i>too short</i>”.</p> <p>You accepted that you had a conversation about the length of dresses being worn that night but you deny saying that Colleague E’s dress was “<i>too short</i>”.</p> <p>The Committee considers that the evidence in support of this charge is unclear. The Committee noted that there was conflict in the evidence as to whether the conversation was based around a “<i>short dress</i>” or a dress being “<i>too short</i>” It is not satisfied that the GDC has adduced sufficient evidence in support of this charge. Accordingly, the Committee finds this Charge not proved.</p>
4.	<p>Between November and December 2022, you made inappropriate physical contact with female colleagues at the Practice, including by:</p>
4.a.	<p>Rubbing Witness A’s arms up and down on one or more occasions, including one on or around 5 December 2022; <b><i>Found proved</i></b></p> <p>Witness A’s evidence was that in December 2022 she went into your surgery where Witness D was also present. She described how you starting rubbing her arms up and down, which made her feel uncomfortable. She shook you off her. Her evidence was she raised these concerns with the previous practice manager, but nothing was done about it.</p> <p>The notes of Witness A’s account in the Practice Investigation dated 21 December 2022 records Witness D as saying “<i>he was touchy feely with you</i>”. Witness A sets out “<i>was touching my arms up and down ... I shook him off – it’s something he always does.</i>”</p> <p>Witness D’s evidence was that on the morning of 5 December 2022, while she was setting her surgery, you “<i>grabbed</i>” Witness A’s shoulders and began to rub them. She describes Witness A telling you to “<i>get off</i>”.</p> <p>You accepted that you touched Witness A’s arms during the course of a conversation when she was upset over something personal which she was discussing with you and as a comforting gesture. Your evidence is that Witness A did not protest or complain after it had happened. You refuted the suggestion that the contact was sexual in nature.</p>

	<p>The Committee has borne in mind that Witness A's account slightly differs from that of Witness D's evidence in that Witness A refers to you touching her arms whereas Witness D refers to you touching Witness A's shoulders. Nevertheless, both witnesses were clear that you initiated the touch and that it was not done in circumstances where Witness A's needed to be comforted.</p> <p>It has accepted Witness A's evidence that you rubbed her arms up and down on or around 5 December 2022 and that this incident took place "out of the blue."</p> <p>The Committee is satisfied that your physical contact with Witness A was inappropriate. Witness A was clear in her statement that you rubbed her arms without her permission and she did not know why you did it. She describes feeling uncomfortable by you touching her. Accordingly, it finds this Charge proved.</p>
4.b.	<p>In or around November 2022, knowing that Witness D did not like to be hugged, you grabbed her from behind to hug her. <b><i>Found not proved</i></b></p> <p>Witness D's evidence was that on one occasion during November 2022 you grabbed her from behind and said to her "<i>On yeah sorry you don't hug do you.</i>" Her evidence was that she told you to get off her and said to you "<i>You know I don't like that.</i>" Witness D explained that she walked out of the surgery and describes being upset by the incident. She also recollected that Witness A saw her walking out of the surgery and asked if she needed to go in and cover for her.</p> <p>Witness D accepted that she did not report this incident in her letter of complaint and explained that she did not include every incident in her letter of complaint.</p> <p>The Committee notes that Witness D's account of this event as set out in her interview on 21 December 2022 at the Practice's investigation record that you grabbed Witness D around her "<i>side.</i>" This is different from Witness D's evidence before the GDC which refers to you grabbing her from behind.</p> <p>Witness A's oral evidence was that she did recollect Witness D raising this incident to her. The Committee considers that it seems likely that Witness A would have remembered this.</p> <p>You denied hugging Witness D from behind but you did admit hugging on more than one occasions.</p> <p>Given the lack of clarity in Witness D's account on this particular matter on how you hugged her, and taking into account Witness A's evidence, the Committee is not satisfied that this Charge is proved to the requisite standard. The Committee found the Charge not proved.</p>

5.	Between 2021 and January 2023, whilst working at the Practice, you failed to treat patients with kindness and compassion, including by:
5.a.	<p>In or around September 2022, responding to a patient's request not to be laid back in the chair due to vertigo by saying words to the effect that you were "<i>not going to break [your] back for her</i>", before then trying to lay her back in the chair despite her request;</p> <p><b>Found not proved</b></p> <p>Witness D recollected that there was an incident in September 2022 when you were treating a patient and where the patient asked not to be laid back in the chair as she had vertigo. Witness D's evidence was that you said to the patient words to the effect that you "<i>were not going to break your back for her</i>" and you tried to lay her backwards. Witness D describes the patient as looking upset at the time and saying that she would try and cope.</p> <p>In Witness D's complaint to Witness I, she makes no mention of this incident. There is no mention of this incident in her interview notes as part of the Practice investigation in December 2022.</p> <p>Your evidence is that your usual practice in situations like this is to explain to the patient that although it is sometimes possible to treat patients sitting upright it would be difficult in her case and you would risk injuring your own back.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that it has received no evidence from the patient. Notwithstanding that the Committee considers Witness D to be a credible and reliable witness, it considered that Witness D may have misinterpreted events. On one view, Witness D's recollection may accord with your explanation and there is no other supporting evidence.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee is not satisfied that this charge has been found proved to the requisite standard. The Committee finds this Charge not proved.</p>
5.b	<p>In or around September 2022, telling a patient, who was a retired nurse, that you "<i>hated all nurses as they killed your mother</i>" or words to that effect;</p> <p><b>Found proved</b></p> <p>Witness D's evidence was that during the consultation with the patient in September 2022 the patient mentioned that she used to be a nurse but she had retired. Witness D's evidence was that you told the patient that "<i>you hated all nurses as they had killed your mother</i>". Witness D described the patient as being "<i>visibly upset</i>" and she tried to reassure the patient that not all nurses were like that and that nurses do care. On Witness D's account, when the patient left the surgery, Witness D checked with her to see if she was okay.</p> <p>Witness D then set out that she walked back into the surgery and asked you if you thought that the comment you made to the patient was out of order.</p>

	<p>Witness D's evidence was that you "<i>started complaining</i>" about how nurses killed your mother.</p> <p>You deny this allegation and explained that many of your patients are nurses as indeed are members of your own family.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that it has received no evidence from the patient in support of this charge. Nevertheless, the Committee was satisfied that Witness D was clear and straightforward in her evidence. Witness D maintained her position regarding this incident in her oral evidence. The Committee accepted Witness D's evidence on this Charge was credible.</p> <p>The Committee considers that telling a patient who was a retired nurse that you hated all nurses as they killed your mother, or words to that effect, was insensitive and inappropriate. Accordingly, it found this Charge proved.</p>
5.c.	<p>Responded to an elderly female patient's comment that she was doing well for her age by saying words to the effect that you had seen a lot of people her age doing a lot better than she was; <b>Found proved</b></p> <p>Witness G's evidence was that an 89 year old female patient came into the Practice for an appointment. Witness G recollected that the patient advised you that she had undergone chemotherapy and that she was doing well for her age.</p> <p>On Witness G 's account, you told the patient that you had seen a lot of people her age doing "<i>a whole lot better than she was.</i>" Witness G describes seeing the patient looking upset and the patient attending a subsequent appointment with her husband.</p> <p>Witness G referred to this incident during the course of the Practice Investigation on 21 December 2022 with the Practice investigation. The notes record "<i>89 year old lady... She said am doing well. Yaz looked at computer + said I have seen 89 year old patients looking better than you. I could tell she was upset.</i>"</p> <p>You accepted that you made the comment to the patient but you explained the context in which it was made. You explained that the patient's health had visibly declined since her last visit and that you asked the patient as to why. The patient explained to you that she was suffering from some illness and that she was doing well for her age. Your evidence is that as part of your safeguarding duty, the health and well-being of elderly and vulnerable adults should be monitored. You say that you tried to encourage the patient not to accept her current state of decline and that life can be better. You maintain that you were acting in the best interests of the patient.</p> <p>The Committee has borne in mind that it has received no evidence from the patient regarding this incident. However, it has found Witness G's evidence</p>

	<p>to be credible and consistent with the account she provided at the Practice Investigation.</p> <p>The Committee considers that the comment that you made to the patient was insensitive and inappropriate as you had no knowledge of the severity of the patient's condition. Further, on Witness G's account, the patient was upset. Accordingly, the Committee found this Charge proved.</p>
5.d.	<p>Responded to a young female patient's comment that she missed her last appointment due to having a lot going on by saying words to the effect that the deposit money from her missed appointment would go towards paying for your car.</p> <p><b>Found not proved</b></p> <p>Witness G's evidence was that she recollected an incident where a girl in her late twenties, came into the practice. Witness G recollected that the patient had missed her previous appointment and you asked her why she missed it. On Witness G's account, the patient said she had a "<i>lot going on</i>". Witness G asserts that you said to the patient that the deposit money from her previous appointment would go towards his nice car outside. The patient did not say anything.</p> <p>Your position is that you do not recollect this incident. In your signed supplemental statement dated 8 July 2025 you set out the policy for payment for treatments and what happens if a patient misses an appointment.</p> <p>The Committee looked at the alleged conversation. Both on Witness G's account and on your account, the Committee considered this was no more than a broad conversation about the patient's appointment. This conversation did not satisfy the stem of the charge and it did not find that it lacked kindness and compassion in providing treatment.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee is not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that this charge is proved. The Committee found this Charge not proved.</p>
6.	<p>Your conduct as alleged at 1 (a), (b), (c), (e), (g), (i), (j), (k), (n), (o), (p) and 4 (a) and (b) above was sexually motivated.</p> <p><b>Found not proved in relation to 1 (a), (b), (c), (e), (i), (j), (k), (n), (o), (p) and 4 (a) and (b)</b></p> <p><b>Found proved in relation to 1(g)</b></p> <p>In respect of 1(a)(i), 1a(ii), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(i) – the Committee found that the comments made were inappropriate but not of a sexual nature. It has concluded that given that the comments were not of a sexual nature, the conduct was not sexually motivated.</p> <p>In respect of 1(e), 1(j), 1(n) and 1(p) the Committee found that the comments made were inappropriate and of a sexual nature. However, it is not satisfied, that these were done either in the pursuit of sexual gratification or in the</p>

	<p>pursuit of a future sexual relationship. In reaching its decision, the Committee has borne in mind that there is no evidence that you were actively trying to engage in a sexual relationship with your female colleagues. For example, there was no evidence that you contacted your female colleagues outside of the professional environment.</p> <p>Regarding the comments you made about colleagues, the Committee was not able to exclude the possibility that the comments were made out of an attempt for you to assert your authority in an inappropriate and unpleasant fashion. It therefore did not infer sexual gratification from your actions. In respect of 1(k) , 1(o) and 4(b) – these Charges have been found not proved.</p> <p>In respect of 1(g)(i) and 1(g)(ii), the Committee has found that this conduct was sexually motivated. The Committee considered that you were inviting physical contact with Witness G by asking her to sit on your knee. With reference to “rape eyes” comments, the Committee considered that this was sexually intimidating and has concluded that there must have been some element of sexual gratification in your comments.</p> <p>In respect of 4(a) the Committee has concluded that the rubbing of Witness A’s arms up and down, which although was inappropriate and uninvited, was not sexually motivated. It considered that the whole circumstances of this incident, including Witness A’s evidence, but could find no sexual context to the situation and/or your actions.</p> <p>The Committee found Charge 6 proved solely in relation to Charge 1(g)(i) and 1(g)(ii).</p> <p>The remainder of Charge 6 was found not proved.</p>
--	--

33. The hearing moves to Stage Two.

## **Stage 2**

### **Decision on fitness to practise**

34. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee then moved on to consider whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct and, if so, whether your practice is currently impaired. Should the Committee determine that your fitness to practise is impaired, it would then be required to consider what sanction, if any, to impose on your registration.

35. In accordance with Rule 20 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2006, the Committee heard submissions by Ms Culleton on behalf of the GDC and those made by Mr Brassington on your behalf in relation to the matters of misconduct, impairment and sanction.

36. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, which included reference to relevant case law.



## **Evidence**

37. The Committee has had regard to the bundle of documents provided at this stage of the hearing, provided on your behalf. This bundle consisted of the following documents:

- Continuing Professional Development (CPD) certificates covering the period 2023 – 2025
- Certificates of completion of short course on medical ethics delivered on 12 May 2025 by the Centre for Remedial Ethics
- A letter dated 12 May 2025 from the Course Leader, who delivered this one-to-one one day course in person.
- Your personal reflections on a range of topics, including on professionalism; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) awareness and diversity and inclusion in dentistry; navigating sexual harassment, sexual harassment in the workplace and attendance on medical ethics training.
- Testimonials from dental colleagues, with whom you have worked, as well as a letter from the Branch President of the Islamic mosque community

## **Submissions**

38. Ms Culleton confirmed that you have no previous fitness to practise history. She submitted that the findings in this case, which include you having repeatedly made comments of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to female colleagues in a professional setting, are serious and amount to misconduct. The comments are said to have caused offence and upset to some of your female colleagues and two of those comments (set out in Charges 1g.i and 1g.ii) were found to be sexually motivated. Ms Culleton also referred to you having made comments of a discriminatory nature towards colleagues and in connection with a male patient, as well as you having made inappropriate physical contact towards a female colleague in December 2022.

39. Ms Culleton submitted that you have breached Principle 6 (Standard 6.2.1), Principle 9 (Standards 9.1.1 and 9.1.2) of the GDC's 'Standards for the Dental Team (2014)' (the Standards). In short, the GDC's position is that the finding against you are serious and would be regarded as deplorable by dental professionals.

40. Turning to current impairment, Ms Culleton acknowledged that you have provided some evidence of reflection, which was mainly in relation to the facts which you accepted, as well as some evidence of you undertaking relevant courses on professional boundaries. However, Ms Culleton submitted that your responses to the charges suggests that you have sought to minimise or justify your comments and or actions. The GDC's position is that the findings against you are a serious departure of the professional standards expected of a registered dentist and include inappropriate comments of a sexual nature made to female colleagues. They also include you failing to treat patients with kindness and compassion in that you made inappropriate comments to them.

41. It was Ms Culleton's submission that the findings against you are attitudinal in nature and are difficult to remediate. She submitted that there is insufficient evidence of remediation to demonstrate that the concerns before the Committee have been sufficiently remediated



so as to mitigate against any risk of repetition of similar conduct. Ms Culleton submitted that given the risk of repetition a finding of current impairment was necessary for the protection of the public.

42. Ms Culleton referred the Committee to the case of *CHRE v NMC & Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) where it was held that the Committee should consider whether a finding of current impairment was required to uphold proper professional standards. She submitted that given the serious nature of the matters found proved, a finding of current impairment was required on the grounds of the public interest.

43. In respect of sanction, Ms Culleton submitted that the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is that of erasure. In support of that contention Ms Culleton referred to the serious nature of the misconduct, which was repeated over a long period of time, which involved an imbalance of power over female dental nurses and the fact that you have not taken full corrective steps. This was a case where your misconduct is said to be fundamentally incompatible with being a dental professional and she submitted that your misconduct could be seen as 'dangerous' in a healthcare environment.

44. Ms Culleton referred the Committee to paragraphs 6.28 (on the factors where suspension may be appropriate) and 6.35 (on the factors where erasure may be appropriate) in the GDC document's 'Guidance for the Practice Committees including Indicative Sanctions Guidance (December 2020)' (the Guidance').

45. Mr Brassington, on your behalf, conceded that the findings against you are capable of amounting to misconduct. By its very nature, the findings of sexually motivated conduct in respect of the comments you said at charges 1g.i. and 1g. ii are sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct, as are the findings of you having made comments of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature or discriminatory nature.

46. It was Mr Brassington's submission that your behaviour is capable of remediation and he referred the Committee to the significant reflection and remediation you have undertaken since these events came to your attention in December 2022, over two and a half years' ago. During that time you have been working as a dentist, without any repeat of the behaviour. Mr Brassington highlighted various extracts of your reflections which indicate that you have taken appropriate steps to change your behaviour. He also invited the Committee to have regard to the supportive testimonials provided at stage 1 and this stage of the proceedings. These testimonials, together with your reflections and targeted CPD, suggest that you do not currently pose a risk to patients and therefore a finding of current impairment for the protection of the public is not made out in this case.

47. However, Mr Brassington conceded that a finding of current impairment by reason of your misconduct on the grounds of the wider public interest was made out, as per the Grant principles.

48. Mr Brassington submitted that the appropriate and proportionate sanction, which would also serve the GDC's statutory objectives, is an order of suspension. He invited the Committee to have regard to the fact that you are of good character in that, save for these proceedings, you have no previous fitness to practise history. Further, you have engaged in significant and targeted remediation. In addition, there has been no evidence of repetition

since December 2022. Mr Brassington submitted that erasure would be disproportionate and would deprive the public of an otherwise good dentist, who has been working in the NHS for 25 years.

### **Committee's decision and reasons on misconduct**

49. The Committee has considered whether any or all of the Charges individually found proved amount to misconduct. In so doing, it has borne in mind the case of *Roylance v GMC* (No. 2) [2000] 1 AC 311, where misconduct is defined as a 'word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances'. Further, to amount to misconduct which impaired fitness to practise, the Committee bore in mind that it must be satisfied that the misconduct amounted to serious professional misconduct.

50. The Committee has considered each of the Charges individually and determined that the following do not amount to misconduct:

Charges 1a.i, 1a.ii, 1.b, 1.c, 1.i and 1.l

51. In reaching its decision, the Committee has concluded that while the comments you made to your female colleagues were clearly inappropriate, they did not amount to a sufficiently serious falling short of professional standards. The Committee did not find that the comments were of a sexual nature nor were they sexually motivated. Whilst unpleasant, the Committee did not find that they reached the level of serious professional misconduct.

52. The Committee has considered each of the Charges individually and determined that the following amount to misconduct:

Charges 1.d, 1.e, 1.f, 1.h.i, 1h.ii, 1.j, 1.m, 1.n, 1.p, 2.b, 2.c, 2.d, 2.e, 2f.i, 2.f.ii, 3.a.i, 3.a.ii, 4.a, 5b and 5 c.

53. In reaching its decision, the Committee considered that the comments you made to your female colleagues, which were found to be variously inappropriate and/or, sexual and/or discriminatory, and lacking in kindness and compassion as set out in its facts determination, were serious and amounted to a serious falling short of professional standards. These included comments such as asking several of your female colleagues questions about their sex lives and telling a female colleague which dental nurses you would "shag" or words to that effect. They also concerned you making comments of an inappropriate and discriminatory nature to female colleagues, and about a male patient. Whilst some of these were of a sexual nature, it considered that these were made out of an attempt by you to assert your authority and were done in a provocative manner to get a reaction out of the other person. The Committee heard from some of the witnesses that you were known to make provocative and inappropriate comments which made them feel uncomfortable.

54. Further, the Committee considered that making inappropriate contact with a female colleague in a professional environment, by rubbing her arms up and down, which was uninvited and made her feel uncomfortable, would be regarded as 'deplorable' by other professionals. In addition, the Committee takes a serious view of its findings that you failed

to treat patients with kindness and compassion on two occasions in which you made inappropriate comments and expressed your personal views.

55. The Committee also determined that Charges 1.g.i, 1.g.ii and Charge 6 (in relation to Charges 1.g.i and 1.g.ii) amounted to misconduct.

56. The Committee has had regard to its finding that during an interaction with a young female colleague Witness G you said to her “*Come sit on my knee and call me uncle ... I’ve got me rape eye on for you*”, which was sexually motivated. The Committee considered that this finding in and of itself is sufficiently serious to amount to a finding of serious professional misconduct.

57. The Committee had regard to the following principles and standards from ‘Standards for the Dental Team’ which it considers you have breached:

- 1.2 You must treat every patient with dignity and respect at all times.
- 1.6 You must treat patients fairly, as individuals and without discrimination.
- 6.1 You must work effectively with your colleagues and contribute to good teamwork.
- 6.1.2 You must treat colleagues fairly and with respect in all situations and all forms of interaction and communication. You must not bully, harass, or unfairly discriminate against them.
- 6.1.4 You must value and respect the contribution of all team members.
- 6.6.1 You should make sure that all team members, including those not registered with the GDC, have ... a work environment that is not discriminatory.
- 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.

58. The Committee is satisfied that the facts found proved are sufficiently serious to amount to falling far short of what can be expected of a reasonable and competent dentist and constitute misconduct.

### **Committee’s decision and reasons on current impairment**

59. The Committee considered that this case involves primarily behavioural concerns, relating to the comments you have made to female colleagues and patients. The Committee has considered whether your misconduct is remediable, whether it has been remedied, and the risk of repetition. The Committee also had regard to the wider public interest, which includes the need to uphold and declare proper standards of conduct and behaviour to maintain public confidence in the profession and this regulatory process.

60. The Committee is satisfied that the misconduct in this case is capable of being remediated. It has borne in mind the steps you have taken to address the concerns since

they were brought to your attention in or around December 2022. You set out in your witness statement that these events led to a period of deep self-analysis, reflection and counselling. You have accepted that some of the comments you made, such as “*women should not change a lightbulb*” have no place in 2025 and are unacceptable. You recognise that as one of the older and more experienced clinicians, you are often looked upon as an example for your colleagues on how to behave and speak.

61. The Committee’s attention has been drawn to the various CPD courses you have attended. This includes your completion of a one-day course on medical ethics delivered on 12 May 2025 by the Centre for Remedial Ethics. The Course Leader commented on your positive engagement throughout the course.

62. You also provided your personal reflections on a range of topics, including on professionalism and equality and inclusion and the expected duties of a dentist.

63. The Committee accepts that you have taken some steps to address the concerns identified in this case once they were brought to your attention in December 2022. It also considers that you have demonstrated some insight into the matters that have brought you before this PCC. However, the Committee considers that your insight, whilst developing, is only partial and does not go into sufficient detail into all the matters found proved against you.

64. For example, in your reflections you state: ‘*my colleagues and I had a discussion during a quiet moment when the room was empty of patients... Unfortunately, while attempting to clarify the situation, I accidentally mentioned a previous, unrelated disagreement with another staff member that involved a sensitive subject. I now understand that it was wrong to discuss this topic in a public space, even though I did not intend for it to be overheard*’. The Committee considered that you have sought to minimise this incident (Charge 3.a.i) with regards to the context and initiation of this conversation.

65. Elsewhere in your reflections, you state: ‘*... talking about a sensitive subject ..., was highly inappropriate. My response was neither tactful nor considerate, and I should have been aware of the context and effect it could have on colleagues, ... even though I was unaware of it*’. The Committee considered that your level of insight in this particular instance (Charge 1.d) was limited in view of your lack of understanding of appropriate behaviour and professional boundaries that must be maintained in a professional environment, and the impact of such behaviour.

66. The Committee considered that although you demonstrated developing insight as to your behaviour and actions, there are areas in which it was limited, for example insufficient depth of reflection of the impact of the incidents on all those involved and insufficient understanding of the consequences and implications of your behaviour on your colleagues. The Committee has noted you have not fully expressed remorse for your actions and a confirmation of a change in your values in regard to professional behaviour and professional relationships.

67. The Committee has borne in mind the supportive testimonials from professional dental colleagues which indicate that you have conducted yourself appropriately since 2022, with no reported concerns.

68. Nevertheless, given that insight is still developing, and despite the steps you have taken thus far, the Committee is not presently able to conclude that your misconduct “*is highly unlikely to be repeated*”. Therefore, there remains a risk of repetition of the inappropriate and unprofessional behaviour. Accordingly, the Committee has determined that a finding of impairment is necessary on the grounds of protecting the public.

69. The Committee has also borne in mind the GDC’s overarching statutory objective which is to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public as well as to promote and maintain public confidence in the professions regulated under this Act. It has had regard to the serious nature of the findings which include making comments that are sexual in nature and in particular a finding that the comments you made to your female colleague in or around October to November 2022 was sexually motivated. In the Committee’s judgement, this was an abuse of your position of trust as one of the senior members of the dental team. You also made comments to female dental colleagues and in connection with a male patient that were discriminatory in nature. The evidence from some of the dental nurses is that they found these comments offensive. The Committee considers that such comments are completely inappropriate and have no place in a dental professional environment.

70. The Committee is satisfied that you have, in the past, brought the dental profession into disrepute. It also considers that the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances.

71. Accordingly, the Committee is satisfied that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct – both in relation to you continuing to pose a risk to members of the public in your current role, and on the grounds of the wider public interest.

### **Committee’s decision and reasons on sanction**

72. The Committee has considered what action, if any, to take in relation to your registration. In so doing, it has taken into account the GDC’s Guidance. The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate and appropriate and, although not intended to be punitive, may have that effect.

73. The Committee took into account the following aggravating features that were present in this case:

- Abuse of position/power imbalance towards your dental colleagues, including junior dental colleagues
- The misconduct was repeated over a period of several years

74. The Committee also took into account the following mitigating features:

- No evidence of further concerns since December 2022
- Previous good character
- Evidence of some remedial action in the form of relevant CPD and reflective pieces

- Evidence of remorse in some of the identified concerns
- Evidence of developing insight

75. The Committee has had regard to its previous findings on misconduct and current impairment in coming to its decision and considered each sanction in ascending order of severity.

76. The Committee first considered whether to impose no order or to issue a reprimand. However, the Committee concluded that it would not be appropriate or sufficient to allow you to return to practice without some form of restriction in place. It therefore rejected both of these courses of action.

77. The Committee then went on to consider whether placing a Conditions of Practice Order on your registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. It bore in mind that any conditions that may be formulated must be workable, measurable, enforceable and address the misconduct and impairment that has been identified.

78. The Committee was of the view that there are no appropriate, practical or workable conditions that could be formulated given that the findings against you relate to comments you made during the course of your professional duties and it would be difficult to draft conditions that would be workable or capable of being monitored for compliance. In addition, given the seriousness of the Committee's findings, it did not consider that conditions would adequately uphold public confidence in the profession.

79. The Committee then went on to consider whether a suspension would be the appropriate sanction. It has borne in mind paragraph 6.28 of the GDC's Guidance which sets out the factors where suspension may be suitable. The Committee considers that the following factors are present in this case:

- There is evidence of repetition of the behaviour;
- Patients' interests would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;
- Public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction

80. The Committee has also had regard to paragraph 6.34 of the GDC's Guidance which sets out the factors where erasure may point to such a conclusion. The Committee considers that the following factors are present in this case:

- One finding that your conduct was sexually motivated
- Serious departure from the relevant professional standards
- The abuse of position of trust, particularly in relation to female dental colleagues

81. The Committee considers that the finding of sexually motivated conduct is serious. It found that the comments you made to Witness G, inviting her to sit on your knee and making reference to having your "*rape eye*" on for her were sexually intimidating. Nevertheless, the Committee has borne in mind that this relates to one finding in the context



of one conversation. The Committee did not find that you were trying to engage in a sexual relationship with her or any of your female colleagues.

82. Furthermore, the Committee has borne in mind that there is no evidence of repetition of similar conduct, either before or since the incident. The Committee has borne in mind the positive testimonials from professional colleagues who have worked with you since the events in question, with no reported concerns.

83. The Committee has borne in mind that you have reflected on your actions and you have engaged in targeted remediation. Taking all these factors into account, the Committee has concluded that whilst the behaviour is attitudinal, you have shown the ability to reflect and taken steps toward remediating your misconduct. The Committee is satisfied that the misconduct in this case was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. The Committee has determined that, whilst some of your comments and behaviour were of a sexual nature, they were made out of an attempt by you to assert your authority and were done in a provocative manner to get a reaction out of the other person, and not in pursuit of a sexual relationship. It was satisfied that, on the evidence before it, whilst your behaviour was highly inappropriate and deplorable, it did not support the GDC's suggestion that you are "*dangerous*". The Committee concluded that erasure would be disproportionate and unduly punitive.

84. Balancing all these factors, the Committee directs your registration be suspended for a period of six months. The Committee has concluded that this sanction is necessary and proportionate to protect patients and to maintain and uphold public confidence in the profession, whilst sending the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a Dental Professional. The Committee considered that 6 months will give you sufficient time to reflect on your misconduct and be able to address fully the limitations in your insight and remediation.

85. The Committee noted the hardship the suspension may cause you, however this is outweighed by the public interest in this regard.

86. The Committee directs that this order be reviewed before its expiry, and you will be informed of the date and time in writing. The reviewing Committee will consider what action it should take in relation to your registration following an assessment of the concerns affecting your fitness to practise.

87. The reviewing Committee may be assisted to receive:

- *Detailed reflective statements demonstrating your further development of insight into the impact that your actions may have on your colleagues;*
- *Updated testimonials;*
- *Any updated relevant CPD.*

88. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether the suspension should take immediate effect to cover the 28-day appeal period.

### **Immediate order**

89. The Interim Order of Conditions currently in place on your registration is hereby revoked.

90. Ms Culleton made an application for an immediate suspension order to be imposed on your registration under Section 30(1) of the Dentists Act 1984. She submitted that an order is necessary on the grounds of public protection and the public interest in light of the Committee's findings at the impairment and sanction stage.

91. Mr Brassington submitted that an immediate order is neither necessary nor desirable in this case. In respect of the public interest, he submitted that this has been dealt with by the six month suspension imposed. Therefore, he submitted that the question is whether there is a real, not fanciful, risk to the public. He submitted that you have continued to work for two and half years since your case was referred to the GDC and there has not been a repetition of the behaviour that brought you before the GDC. He also referred the Committee to the reports of the workplace reporter (appointed as part of your interim conditions of practice order which has now been revoked), which stated that your behaviour has been exemplary at work. Furthermore, he submitted that your NHS patients would be deprived of your services if an immediate order is imposed, and that is a factor that needs to be weighed in the balance.

92. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who drew its attention to the relevant guidance contained at paragraphs 6.35 to 6.38 of the GDC's Indicative Sanctions Guidance which deals with immediate orders.

93. The Committee determined that the imposition of an immediate order of suspension on your registration is necessary for the protection of the public.

94. The Committee has already identified that your insight into your misconduct is still developing and there remains a risk of repetition of the inappropriate and unprofessional behaviour. Consequently, the Committee has determined that there is an ongoing risk of harm to the public, which includes your colleagues, and which necessitates an immediate order. It took into account that in the absence of an immediate order, you could return to unrestricted clinical practice during the 28-day appeal period, or for potentially longer, in the event of an appeal. An immediate order is therefore necessary to protect the public.

95. The effect of this immediate order is that your registration is now suspended. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive direction of suspension for a period of six months will replace the immediate suspension upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period. Should you exercise your right of appeal, this immediate order shall remain in force pending the resolution of the appeal.

96. That concludes this determination.