

PUBLIC HEARING**Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing****4 September 2026****Name:** MADAHAR, Gaurav**Registration number:** 265514**Case number:** CAS-209901-K4H6P8

General Dental Council: Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel.
Instructed by Holly Watt, IHLPS**Registrant:** Present
Represented by Jonathan Lally, Counsel.
Instructed by Kennedys Law

Fitness to practise: Not impaired by reason of misconduct or conviction**Outcome:** Fitness to practise no longer impaired. Suspension revoked

Committee members: Val Evans (Lay) (Chair)
Janhvi Amin (Dentist)
Rita Eaton (Lay)**Legal adviser:** Alastair McFarlane**Committee Secretary:** Andrew Keeling

Mr Madahar,

1. This was a review hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) in accordance with Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing was for this PCC to review your case and determine what action to take in relation to your registration.
2. You were present at the hearing and represented by Mr Jonathan Lally, Counsel. Miss Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

Background

3. Your case was first considered by a PCC at a hearing which took place between 10 and 12 December 2025. You attended the hearing and were represented. That Committee found proved the following charges against you:

'That being registered as a dentist:

1. *On 17 March 2023, you were convicted at Peterborough Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 15 October 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.*
2. *You failed to inform the General Dental Council immediately that, on or around 15 October 2022, you had been charged with driving a motor vehicle with Excess Alcohol.*
3. *Your actions in relation to allegation 2 were:*
 - a. Misleading, and/or*
 - b. Dishonest.'*
4. That Committee determined that your misleading and dishonest conduct amounted to misconduct.
5. In respect of your conviction, that Committee found your fitness to practise to be impaired on the wider public interest. Its reasons were as follows:

'The Committee first considered the issue of your conviction. It had regard to the nature and circumstances of your offence, which was for drink driving. On 15 October 2022, whilst you were driving with excess alcohol, you were involved in a road traffic incident where your car collided with another vehicle. The Committee considered, and it was not disputed by you, that this was a very

serious offence. The Committee took into account that your actions and behaviour put members of public at risk of harm.

The Committee took into account that you were sentenced by the court in relation to your offence, which included a fine and a period of disqualification from driving. The Committee noted that you have completed the Drink Drive Awareness course offered to you by the court. It also bore in mind that there is no evidence before it at this hearing of any repeat offending since October 2022, which is now over three years ago. The Committee had regard to these factors in its consideration of the risk of repetition. The Committee also had regard to your written evidence and your oral evidence given at the first stage of the hearing, which included your evidence that you no longer drink alcohol at all if driving.

The Committee also took into account that you have shown remorse for your drink driving behaviour, and it was satisfied, having heard from you that you are fully aware of the potential risks and consequences should such conduct recur, including in relation to your registration. It was the view of the Committee having considered all the evidence, including of the steps you have taken around your learning, such as your CPD in the use of alcohol, that it is highly unlikely that you would repeat your offending.

However, the Committee considered the wider public interest, as it is required to do. It took into account the nature and seriousness of your offence and concluded that public confidence in the dental profession and the maintenance of proper professional standards would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in all the circumstances.

The Committee therefore determined that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction.'

6. In respect of your misconduct, that Committee also found your fitness to practise to be impaired. Its reasons were as follows:

You failed to report immediately to the GDC that you had been charged with a criminal offence. The Committee considered that it is possible to remedy such a failing, albeit after the event, by recognising the omission and also the significance of the failing. The Committee took into account that your failure in this case included the element of dishonesty, which is an attitudinal issue and therefore, in its view, a more difficult concern to remedy, although not impossible.

Therefore, in considering whether you have in fact remedied the misconduct that has been found against you, the Committee assessed your evidence, both written

and oral, for any insight into the significance of your failing and for any evidence of relevant remediation.

It was the conclusion of the Committee, based on what it has seen and heard, that you have demonstrated some insight into your failure to immediately report your criminal charge to the GDC. It also considered that you have taken some, although limited, steps to prevent recurrence. It noted the evidence drawn to its attention regarding your efforts to ensure that you remain compliant with your regulatory requirements and it noted that you have reviewed the GDC Standards.

However, the Committee was not satisfied that it received sufficient evidence of your insight and reflection in relation to the significance of your breach in failing to inform and into your associated dishonesty. Honesty and integrity are fundamental to the dental profession, and failing to impart such crucial information about yourself to the GDC undermined the regulatory process. Whilst the Committee acknowledged that you are now more aware of your professional obligations, including in relation to declaring any criminal proceedings, it was not satisfied that you have demonstrated adequate understanding of the seriousness of your dishonesty. In the Committee's view, you have not yet shown that you have taken full responsibility for your omission and the impact that had on the GDC's ability to be an effective regulator.

The Committee agreed that the risk of you repeating your misconduct is somewhat reduced on account of these proceedings. However, given its concerns about the limited nature of your insight, reflection and remediation, the Committee could not conclude that the risk is entirely removed.

In light of this identified potential for repetition, the Committee considered the issue of public protection is engaged in this case, taking into account that a failure to report criminal matters to one's regulator impacts on the ability to assess fitness to practise for the safety of the public. However, the Committee was of the view that the wider public interest is more significantly engaged in relation to the misconduct matters. Your dishonest failure to immediately report your criminal charge to the GDC breached fundamental tenets of the profession and brought the profession into disrepute. In addition, you have failed to fully grasp the seriousness of what you did and why your failure mattered.

Having taken all the circumstances into account, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct.

7. That Committee directed that your name should be suspended from the Register for a period of nine months, with a review to take place before the expiry of the order. It considered that a suspension order was the most appropriate and proportionate sanction. It considered your case to be serious and that public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction. The Committee had

considered whether to erase your name from the Register. However, it was satisfied that there was no evidence before it that you had a harmful deep-seated attitudinal problem, which might have made erasure the more appropriate sanction. Furthermore, the Committee noted that your dishonesty was not covered up, once discovered, and you had demonstrated some insight into your wrongdoing, and had taken some steps to address the arising concerns. Taking this into account, the Committee decided that erasure would be disproportionate and punitive.

8. That Committee considered that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by receiving the following from you:

- Evidence of your further reflection, remediation and developed insight, including how your behaviour in this case impacted on the public's perception of the dental profession.
- Any other evidence that you consider may be helpful.

Today's Review

9. It was the role of the Committee today to undertake a comprehensive review of this case. In so doing, the Committee had careful regard to all the documentary evidence before it, took account of the submissions made by both parties and your oral evidence. The Committee also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees* (6 January 2026) (*"the Guidance"*).

GDC Submissions

10. Miss Bagott submitted that the GDC was neutral on the question as to whether your fitness to practise is impaired. She submitted that it was a matter for the Committee, on the basis of the information before it, whether you have demonstrated that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Oral Evidence

11. You gave oral evidence at this hearing. You explained that after the substantive hearing it was a very tough time for you. You therefore made the decision to move back to your parents' house for four to five months. You explained that discussing the matters with your parents helped you *"to reset your moral compass"* and reflect on your actions.

12. You also explained that you undertook charity work in India during the period of your suspension. This involved assisting local communities by providing food. You said that being able to help people in need made you proud. You also explained that it was similar to being a dentist in that you were placed in a position of trust. You also

undertook tutoring during your suspension period for your parents' neighbours, which you enjoyed.

13. You explained that between June and August 2026 you undertook Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses on probity, ethics and professionalism. You explained that this taught you that your conduct has an impact on the public's wider perception of the dental profession.
14. In respect of returning to work, you told the Committee that you had worked for three years at your practice prior to your suspension. You have kept in contact with the practice principal and the practice remains very supportive of you. You explained that you would undertake a gradual and phased return to work if the suspension were to be revoked.

Mr Lally's Submissions

15. Mr Lally, on your behalf, submitted that your drink drive conviction is of some age now. He submitted that there is a limited risk of repetition and it has been a salutary lesson for you. He submitted that the Committee could safely conclude that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired on the basis of your conviction.
16. In respect of your misconduct, Mr Lally submitted that the previous Committee had determined that your dishonest behaviour could be remediated. He submitted that you have spent significant time addressing the underlying issues that led to it happening. You initially had difficulty in accepting your dishonest behaviour, but you have taken significant time to go back to basics. You went back to live with your parents to reset your moral compass. You then spent significant time doing good deeds and paying back to the community here and in India. This led to introspective reflection as to what it means to be a human and a dentist, and the element of trust placed in dentists by patients. He also submitted that you have undergone CPD courses, which has enabled you to consider and reflect upon your regulatory requirements.
17. Mr Lally invited the Committee to conclude that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of your misconduct. He referred to the significant remediation and reflection you have undertaken. He submitted that this showed you now have significant insight in relation to your misconduct. Furthermore, he submitted that you have an action plan in place to ensure it does not happen again, which makes repetition of your misconduct unlikely.

Decision on Current Impairment

18. In making its decision, the Committee first sought to determine whether your fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of your misconduct and/or conviction. It exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decision of the previous committee. It balanced your interests with those of the public and bore in mind

that its primary duty is to protect the public, including maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour.

19. In respect of your conviction, the Committee considered that the seriousness of your conviction and the impact on the wider public interest have been sufficiently and appropriately marked by the period of your suspension and your driving disqualification.
20. Accordingly, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise is not currently impaired by reason of your conviction.
21. The Committee then went to consider the issue of your dishonesty. It noted the findings of the substantive Committee that your dishonest conduct was not representative of a deep-seated attitudinal issue and that you did not try to conceal your dishonesty once it was discovered. However, that Committee had '*concerns about the limited nature of your insight, reflection and remediation*'. The Committee also took into account the recommendations from the substantive Committee about the further information a reviewing Committee may consider helpful.
22. The Committee firstly considered that your dishonest behaviour was remediable. It carefully considered all of the evidence before it, including your written reflective statement, dated 28 August 2026, and your oral evidence. It considered that you have undertaken significant reflection on your dishonest conduct. It noted that during the initial period of your suspension, you moved back to live with your parents in order "*to reset your moral compass*". You explained that you now understood the underlying issues that made you act dishonesty in the first place. You also explained the importance of putting the profession first and your regulatory requirements in informing the GDC of any convictions, rather than the GDC relying on other sources. The Committee also noted that your charity work and tutoring help you to understand the importance of the trust placed in dentists by patients and the wider public.
23. The Committee also took into account the targeted and extensive CPD courses you have undertaken during your suspension period, which included courses in respect of fitness to practise cases, legal and ethical responsibilities, duty of candour, the GDC standards and professionalism. The Committee also noted that you have an action plan in place to return to work and the supportive references from your practice.
24. Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee determined that the risk of repetition of your dishonest conduct is minimal in light of your detailed and significant reflection. In the Committee's view, you have clearly demonstrated that you fully understand the seriousness of your dishonest conduct and the impact this could have on the patients, the public and fellow members of your profession.

25. Therefore, the Committee has concluded that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of your misconduct. In the Committee's view, a well-informed member of the public would not be shocked or troubled if a finding of impairment was not made in your case, based on all of the evidence before the Committee today.
26. Accordingly, for all these reasons, the Committee determined, pursuant to Section 27C(1)(a) of the Dentists Act 1984, as amended, to terminate the suspension order with immediate effect.
27. That concludes this hearing today.