

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

5 February 2026

Name: HENDRY, Johanne

Registration number: 5776

Case number: CAS-207262-J9D1Q0

General Dental Council: Andrew Molloy, Counsel
Instructed by Amy Jones, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present
Not Represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)

Duration: 12 Months

Committee members: Carson Black (Chair, Dentist Member)
Amit Jinabhai (Lay Member)
Stacey Firby (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal Adviser: Emma Boothroyd

Committee Secretary: Lola Bird

1. This is a resumed hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC), pursuant to section 36Q of the *Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)* ('the Act').
2. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.
3. The purpose of this hearing has been for the Committee to review a substantive order of suspension currently in place on Ms Hendry's registration.
4. Ms Hendry is not present at these proceedings, and she is not represented in her absence. The Case Presenter for the General Dental Council (GDC) is Mr Andrew Molloy, Counsel.

Application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the registrant

5. At the outset, Mr Molloy made an application under Rule 54 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006* ('the Rules'), to proceed with the hearing notwithstanding Ms Hendry's absence.
6. Mr Molloy drew the Committee's attention to the relevant documents on service and submitted that Ms Hendry had been notified in accordance with the Rules and the Act.
7. In submitting that the hearing should proceed in Ms Hendry's absence, Mr Molloy referred the Committee to an email from her dated 12 January 2026. Mr Molloy submitted that it was clear from that email that Ms Hendry had chosen not to take part in today's hearing. Mr Molloy submitted that in the circumstances, it was fair, proportionate and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in Ms Hendry's absence.
8. The Committee took account of Mr Molloy's submissions, and the supporting documentation he drew to its attention. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the issues of service and proceeding with a hearing in the absence of a registrant.

Decision on service

9. The Committee considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Ms Hendry in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the Rules and section 50A of the Act.
10. The Committee had before it a copy of the Notice of Hearing, dated 7 January 2026 ('the notice'), which was sent to Ms Hendry's registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post. The Committee took into account that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove delivery of the notice, only that it was sent. However, the Committee was provided with a Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' receipt, which confirmed that the copy of the notice sent to Ms Hendry by Special Delivery was delivered on 8 January 2026.
11. The Committee also noted that on 7 January 2026, a copy of the notice was sent to Ms Hendry by way of an attachment within a secure email, and there is evidence that the attachment was downloaded on 8 January 2026. The Committee further noted that Ms Hendry has corresponded with the GDC regarding this hearing.

12. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Ms Hendry complied with the 28-day notice period required by the Rules. It was further satisfied that the notice contained all the required particulars, including the date and time of the hearing, and that it was intended that the hearing would take place remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link. Ms Hendry was also advised that the Committee had the power to proceed with the hearing in her absence.

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

Decision on whether to proceed in the absence of the registrant

14. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Hendry. It approached this issue with the utmost care and caution. The Committee took into account the factors to be considered in reaching its decision, as set out in the case of *R v Jones* [2002] UKHL 5, and as affirmed in subsequent regulatory cases, including the joined cases of *General Medical Council v Adeogba* and *General Medical Council v Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

15. The Committee bore in mind that fairness to Ms Hendry is an important consideration. It was also mindful of the need to be fair to the GDC, and of the public interest in the expeditious review of the suspension order currently in place on Ms Hendry's registration.

16. The Committee was satisfied that all reasonable efforts had been made by the GDC to notify Ms Hendry of the hearing and that she is aware of today's proceedings. It noted that in an email to the GDC dated 12 January 2026, Ms Hendry stated that "*I won't be attending the review, apologies in advance*". She attached to that email a reflective statement dated 12 January 2026 and evidence of her Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for the Committee's consideration.

17. It was the view of the Committee, having considered the email from Ms Hendry, that there would be no benefit to adjourning today's hearing. It took into account that Ms Hendry did not request an adjournment, and no information has been provided to suggest that deferring the hearing would secure her attendance on a future date. The Committee noted that Ms Hendry did not attend the initial PCC hearing of this case in February 2025. It was satisfied that her absence from today's resumed hearing is voluntary.

18. The Committee took into account that it had a duty to review the suspension order currently in place on Ms Hendry's registration, which is shortly due to expire. The Committee considered that without good reason for an adjournment, today's hearing should go ahead as scheduled. It was satisfied that it was in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Hendry.

Summary of the case background

19. Ms Hendry's case was first considered by a PCC at a hearing held in February 2025. She did not attend that hearing and she was not represented in her absence. That initial PCC considered and found proved allegations relating to Ms Hendry's conduct and behaviour in accessing

confidential patient medical records held by Person A, a medical professional who was known to Ms Hendry.

20. In determining that the facts found proved against Ms Hendry amounted to misconduct, the initial PCC stated the following:

“The Committee has found that Miss Hendry inappropriately accessed confidential patient records between January and November 2021 held by Person A. There was no clinical justification for her looking at the patient records, which by their very nature would have related to confidential information. The patients in question were particularly vulnerable. Miss Hendry then made copies of those records and sought to use her knowledge of those patient records as leverage against Person A. Miss Hendry’s conduct in this regard was intended to cause harm to Person A and indeed did cause harm to them.

Miss Hendry’s actions were compounded in that she knowingly provided false information to the NHS regarding the confidential patient records in an attempt to cover up her wrongdoing. The Committee found her actions were misleading and dishonest.

...

The Committee considers that Miss Hendry’s actions fell far below the conduct expected of a registered dental professional and would bring the profession into disrepute. In the Committee’s view, Miss Hendry put her own needs ahead of patients and her professional responsibilities. Taking all these factors into account, the Committee is satisfied that the findings are serious and amount to misconduct.”

21. The initial PCC went on to determine that Ms Hendry’s fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her misconduct, stating that:

“The Committee has borne in mind Miss Hendry’s apology to the NHS Trust dated 16 November 2021. It has also had regard to the letter from Miss Hendry to the GDC dated 28 November 2024 in which she acknowledged the distress she caused Person A. She also set out her personal circumstances leading up to the events in question and described how it has impacted upon her.

However, the Committee considers that Miss Hendry has not expressed any real insight into her actions or the potential impact or risk. The Committee considered that there is a high risk of repetition of the misconduct it has found proved in the absence of full insight. It therefore concluded that a finding of impairment by reason of Miss Hendry’s misconduct is necessary in the interest of public protection.

The Committee further considered that public confidence in the profession and in the GDC as its regulator would be severely undermined if a finding of impairment in relation to misconduct was not made given the serious nature of the findings in this case. Accordingly, it determined that a finding of impairment by reason of Miss Hendry’s misconduct is in the wider public interest”.

22. By way of sanction, the initial PCC directed that Ms Hendry's registration should be suspended for a period of 12 months. It further directed a review of the order shortly before the expiry of the 12-month period. In directing a review, the initial PCC stated that:

"The reviewing Committee may be assisted to receive:

- *A detailed reflective statement demonstrating Miss Hendry's insight into and understanding of the dishonesty and its impact on patients, the dental profession and public confidence.*
- *Information from Miss Hendry regarding any Continuing Professional Development undertaken on data protection and information governance".*

Today's review

23. This is the first review of the substantive order of suspension imposed on Ms Hendry's registration in February 2025. In comprehensively reviewing the order today, the Committee considered all the evidence before it, including the reflective statement and CPD evidence provided by Ms Hendry with her email of 12 January 2026. The Committee took account of the submissions made by Mr Molloy on behalf of the GDC.

24. Mr Molloy submitted that at this review, there is a persuasive burden on Ms Hendry to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired. Mr Molloy stated that as Ms Hendry has not attended the hearing, the Committee has not been able to hear directly from her.

25. It was Mr Molloy's submission that whilst this Committee is not bound by the recommendations of the initial PCC, that Committee set out what it considered would assist this reviewing Committee. In this regard, Mr Molloy submitted that although Ms Hendry has provided a reflective statement, it is very short, with little detail of embedded learning and/or reflection. Mr Molloy further submitted that the CPD completed by Ms Hendry was undertaken at a late stage. Mr Molloy submitted that Ms Hendry has demonstrated a lack of interest in the recommendations made by the initial PCC and these proceedings in general which, he said, is compounded by her having stated in her written reflections that she has no plan to return to dentistry or stay on the GDC Register.

26. Mr Molloy invited the Committee to consider the relevant paragraphs on impairment, as set out in the GDC's *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (Effective from 6 January 2026)'* ('the Guidance'). It was his submission that Ms Hendry's fitness to practise remains impaired, given that there has been very little evidence of remediation and/or insight since the initial PCC hearing in February 2025. Mr Molloy also added that Ms Hendry has now been out of clinical practice for 12 months, which may raise issues around training needs and skills gaps. Mr Molloy submitted that there has been no significant change in the circumstances of this case, and he invited the Committee to find current impairment on the same grounds stated previously.

27. With regard to sanction, it was Mr Molloy's submission that it would be appropriate and proportionate to extend the current order of suspension on Ms Hendry's registration by a period of 12 months, given that the material provided in relation to her remediation and insight is insufficient.

The Committee's decisions

28. In reaching its decisions, the Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the approach it should take in conducting its review and the applicable legal principles and guidance.

Decision on current impairment

29. The Committee first considered whether Ms Hendry's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct. In doing so, it exercised its independent judgement. It had regard to the overarching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety, and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.

30. The Committee took into account the serious nature of Ms Hendry's misconduct, which persisted over several months, involved dishonest behaviour and an attempt to cover up her wrongdoing. The Committee took into account that dishonesty is an attitudinal failing and therefore difficult to remedy, although not impossible. In considering whether Ms Hendry's misconduct has been remedied, the Committee had regard to the evidence placed before it today at this review.

31. The Committee considered Ms Hendry's reflective statement of 12 January 2026 and noted her apology. She stated that *"I wish to express how sorry I am that I gave reason for the public, my peers and the gdc to mistrust me"*. She also stated that over the past four years she has had time to reflect on her actions, stating that *"I myself would expect complete honesty and integrity from anyone in my life or in a public facing role and I am ashamed I did not uphold to that standard myself"*. The Committee also took into account the evidence of Ms Hendry's CPD, which is a single certificate confirming that she completed an e-learning course on 11 January 2026 entitled 'Information Governance, Data Protection & GDPR'.

32. It was the view of the Committee, having considered the evidence provided by Ms Hendry, that it falls significantly short of demonstrating sufficient insight and successful remediation. In reaching its conclusion, the Committee took into account the limited detail provided by Ms Hendry in relation to reflection, which she stated has been ongoing over the past four years. The Committee also noted the very recent nature of Ms Hendry's CPD with no evidence of any reflection on what she learnt from that course. The Committee also bore in mind that Ms Hendry's misconduct covered several aspects of conduct and behaviour, including dishonesty. It was not clear to the Committee from Ms Hendry's written reflections what learning has taken place and whether there has been an embedding of any learning.

33. The Committee had regard to paragraph 236 of the Guidance, which states that:

"Examples of how a registrant may demonstrate insight include:

a. Reviewing their own performance or conduct.

b. Recognising that they should have acted differently in the circumstances being considered.

c. Identifying and putting in place measures that will prevent a recurrence of such circumstances.

d. Reflecting on the magnitude and consequences of their conduct for others”.

34. The Committee was not reassured by the material placed before it, that Ms Hendry has demonstrated sufficient insight into her misconduct, and as a result her attempt at remediation is evidently lacking. In view of this, the Committee considered that the risk of repetition in this case remains high, and it concluded that there would be an ongoing risk of harm if Ms Hendry were permitted to return to unrestricted practice at this stage. Whilst the Committee noted that Ms Hendry has stated that she has no wish to return to dentistry, it was mindful that she currently remains registered as a dental care professional and could return to practice at any time if the current order were allowed to expire. Accordingly, the Committee determined that a finding of impairment is necessary for the protection of the public.

35. The Committee also determined that such a finding is required in the wider public interest, given the very limited evidence of insight and remediation from Ms Hendry. It considered that public confidence in the dental profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances. The Committee also considered the need to uphold and maintain proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

36. The Committee therefore determined that Ms Hendry’s fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct.

Decision on sanction

37. The Committee next considered what action to take in respect of Ms Hendry’s registration. It had regard to section 36Q(1) of the Act, which sets out the options available to it at this review. The Committee also took into account the Guidance. It noted that the purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with Ms Hendry’s interests.

38. The Committee considered that it would be wholly inappropriate to terminate the suspension order currently in place on Ms Hendry’s registration or to allow it to lapse, given the ongoing risk identified in relation to the public and the wider public interest.

39. The Committee next considered whether it could replace the current order of suspension with a conditions of practice order. However, it concluded that it could not formulate any workable conditions that would address the gravity of Ms Hendry’s misconduct, which involved serious dishonesty. Particularly in the light of insufficient evidence of insight and remediation. The Committee determined that conditions would not be proportionate in the circumstances. It also took into account that Ms Hendry is not currently working in dentistry and her engagement with the fitness to practise process had been relatively limited. The Committee was not confident that she would comply with conditions even if they could be formulated. Therefore it was not satisfied that a conditions of practice order would protect the public and the wider public interest.

40. In all the circumstances, the Committee determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction to protect the public and the wider public interest is to extend the current suspension order. The Committee directs that the current order be extended by a period of 12 months. In deciding on the maximum period, the Committee took into account the need to protect the public and uphold the public interest. It also considered the amount of time that Ms Hendry would need to demonstrate sufficient insight into all of the concerns in this case and undertake more in-depth remediation.

41. The Committee directs that a review of the order of suspension should take place at a resumed hearing to be held shortly before the end of the 12-month period. Ms Hendry will be informed of the date and time of that resumed hearing. The Committee emphasises that the persuasive burden will rest with Ms Hendry at that review to demonstrate how she has addressed her impairment. The Committee would also wish to highlight that all options will be available to that next Committee, including the option to indefinitely suspend Ms Hendry's registration.

42. The Committee considered that should Ms Hendry wish to fully engage with this process, the next reviewing Committee would be assisted by receiving the following from her:

- A further reflective statement, which addresses the seriousness and magnitude of the facts found proved in February 2025, their impact on all parties involved and the wider public interest.
- Evidence of the steps taken to avoid repetition of the misconduct.

43. Unless Ms Hendry exercises her right of appeal, the current order of suspension on her registration will be extended by a period of 12 months, from the date of the expiry of the current order. This will take effect 28 days from the date that notice of this direction is deemed to have been served upon her. In the event that she does exercise her right of appeal, the order of suspension currently in place on her registration will remain in force until the resolution of the appeal.

44. That concludes this determination.