

**GENERAL DENTAL COUNCIL  
PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT COMMITTEE**

**June 2008 – August 2010**

**ABBASSIAN, Ardeshir**

**Registration No: 81602**

Ardeshir Abbassian [address redacted] Tandläkare Umeå 1980, was summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008 for inquiry into the following charge:

Amended with the agreement of both parties

“That, being a registered dentist:

1. Since August 2004 you have practised as a dental surgeon at 2 High Street, Gosport, Hampshire PO12 1BX (the Practice).
2. In or about September 2004, when Patient 1 (who is identified in the attached Schedule) registered with you as a National Health Service patient, you caused or permitted your staff to require her to pay a deposit of £20.00, refundable against the cost of future treatment.
3. On or about 20<sup>th</sup> September 2005, Patient 1 attended the practice for her first appointment since her registration, when you:-
  - (a) did not carry out an examination of Patient 1's oral mucosa;
  - (b) did not carry out an examination of Patient 1's periodontal health;
  - (c) did not carry out any charting of Patient 1's teeth;
  - (d) took two bitewing radiographs, but did not make a written report of these radiographs or make a record of the area of translucency at LR5;
  - (e) made a record in the patient's notes that you had provided her with a scale and polish;
  - (f) did not provide the patient with any explanation as to your charges for the appointment;
  - (g) did not obtain the patient's consent to your carrying out the scale and polish in writing on form FP17 DC;
  - (h) caused or permitted your staff to require Patient 1 to pay a charge of £15.32 in respect of the appointment;
  - (i) refused to refund the charge described at (h) above, informing Patient 1 that as the period of one year had elapsed since she paid the deposit referred to at paragraph 2 above the deposit was no longer refundable.
4. At a meeting with Patient 1 on or about 21<sup>st</sup> September 2005 you informed the patient that your charge for a scale and polish was £25.00.
5. You submitted a claim to the Dental Practice Board for payment for a scale and polish, a clinical examination, advice, charting and a report in respect of Patient 1, which was received by the Dental Practice Board on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2005.

6. The claim described at paragraph 5 above should not have been made, as:-
  - (a) you had not carried out an adequate clinical examination and charting and had not provided any advice or a report;
  - (b) you had received payment from the patient in respect of the appointment.
7. When Patient 1 made a complaint about the matters set out at paragraph 3 above you did not provide an adequate response to her complaint.
8. On or about 18<sup>th</sup> March 2005 Patient 2 (who is identified in the attached Schedule) who was registered with the Practice as a National Health Service patient, attended you with pain in the upper right quadrant of her mouth, when you:-
  - (a) diagnosed an abscess at UR5 and a fractured amalgam filling at UR6;
  - (b) provided the patient with a prescription for an antibiotic.
9. On or about 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2005 Patient 2 attended you with pain in the upper right quadrant of her mouth, when you:-
  - (a) advised her to continue taking the antibiotics and to take analgesics;
  - (b) did not carry out any further investigation into the cause of the patient's pain;
  - (c) did not take any adequate steps to treat the patient's pain.
10. On or about 7<sup>th</sup> April 2005 you commenced treatment for Patient 2 by way of the provision of a bridge at UL1 to UR2, to replace UR1, when you:-
  - (a) had not carried out an adequate pre-treatment assessment;
  - (b) caused bruising to Patient 2's cheeks, chin and chest area;
  - (c) told Patient 2 to "shut up and not to move", or words to that effect;
  - (d) did not provide Patient 2 with a temporary bridge at UL1.
11. On or about 20<sup>th</sup> April 2005 you provided treatment to Patient 2 by way of a gold crown to UL6, when you:
  - (a) had not carried out an adequate pre-treatment assessment;
  - (b) left caries and/or cotton under the gold crown.
12. Between about 12<sup>th</sup> July 2005 and September 2005 you provided treatment to Patient 3 (who is identified in the attached Schedule) who was a patient entitled to be exempt from National Health Service charges, under a National Health Service Continuing Care Arrangement.
13. During the course of treatment identified at paragraph 12 above you:-
  - (a) did not obtain the patient's consent to your carrying out private treatment in writing on Form FP17 DC;
  - (b) did not carry out any charting;
  - (c) required Patient 3 to pay the total sum of £257.09 by way of charges in respect of the treatment that she understood to be NHS treatment;
  - (d) failed to maintain proper clinical records in respect of the patient, in that:-
    - (i) the record you did maintain in respect of the treatment you provided was inadequate;

- (ii) you did not make a record of any charting of the patient's teeth;
- (iii) you recorded that the patient failed to attend appointments on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2005 and 1<sup>st</sup> September 2005, when in fact the patient did attend and received treatment from you on these dates;
- (iv) the treatment you recorded as having been provided to the patient at an appointment on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2005 is not in fact the treatment you provided.

14. In fact:-

- (a) the patient was entitled to an exemption from National Health Service charges;
- (b) pursuant to the National Health Service arrangement you were entitled to the sum of £119.45 in respect of the treatment;
- (c) had she not been entitled to an exemption from National Service fees, the sum payable by the patient would have been £95.56, the balance between this sum and the sum at paragraph 14 (b) above being paid by the NHS.

15. In or about September 2005 you made a claim in respect of the course of treatment referred to at paragraph 12 above, as a result of which:-

- (a) you were reimbursed for an extensive examination, which includes periodontal charting;
- (b) in addition to the sum paid by the patient referred to at paragraph 13(c) above you were reimbursed by the Dental Practice Board for the difference between the amount payable by the patient in the absence of an exemption (identified at paragraph 14(c) above) and the amount allowable by the Statement of Dental Remuneration (identified at paragraph 14(b) above) ie the sum of £23.89.

16. On or about 18<sup>th</sup> April 2005 you saw Patient 4 (who is identified in the attached schedule) for a six monthly check up, when:-

- (a) you did not use a probe to examine the patient's teeth and their surrounding tissues;
- (b) you informed the patient that her teeth were fine.

17. On or about 26<sup>th</sup> April 2005 you saw Patient 4 who was complaining of pain in a tooth in the upper left quadrant of her mouth, when (the patient's records having been mislaid):-

- (a) you did not make a record of the appointment;
- (b) you did not take or record a medical history from the patient.

18. On or after 26<sup>th</sup> April 2005, and in respect of the appointment which took place on that date, you caused or permitted the letters 'FTA' (meaning failed to attend) to be written on a record card bearing Patient 4's name.

19. Your attention to issues of cross infection control was inadequate, in that:-

- (a) you stopped dental nurses at the practice taking the hand pieces off the instruments and putting them in the autoclave, and required them to wipe them;
- (b) dental nurses were allowed to change their masks only once or twice during the working day, at lunchtime;

- (c) OPG bite pegs were on occasion only rinsed between use upon two patients, without being sterilised;
- (d) on occasion mirrors and probes were not changed between patients who were from the same family;
- (e) you caused or permitted the disposal of items of clinical waste in the domestic waste;
- (f) you used alcohol wipes to clean instruments instead of sterilising them between patients;
- (g) you used your mobile telephone, both to have a conversation and to send text messages whilst treating a patient, without changing your gloves or washing your hands.

20. WITHDRAWN.

21. During the course of the working day you would on occasion shout at members of your staff and your dental colleague within the hearing of patients.

22. Your conduct as described at each of paragraphs 5, 13(c) and 15 was;

- (a) misleading;
- (b) dishonest;

23. Your conduct as described at each of paragraphs 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, above was:-

- (a) unprofessional;
- (b) inappropriate;
- (c) contrary to the best interests of the patients.

“And that, in relation to the facts alleged, you have been guilty of serious professional misconduct.”

On 24<sup>th</sup> June 2008 the Chairman made the following statement regarding the finding of facts:

“Mr Abbassian

I have to announce that the facts alleged in the following Heads of Charge have not been proved to the satisfaction of the Committee:

4,

10(amended to read:”...by way of the provision of a bridge at UL2 to UR1 to replace UL1...”10(a) and 10(b), 13(d)(i), 16(a), 19(a), (b), (d), (e) and (f)

In relation to these facts you have been found not guilty of serious professional misconduct.

In relation to the following Heads of Charge, which you have admitted, the facts have been proved to the satisfaction of the Committee:

1, 3(e), (g), (h),(amended to read: “caused or permitted your staff to require Patient 1 and her husband to pay a charge of £30.64 in respect of their appointments” and 3(i), 5, 8(a) and (b), 9(a), 13(a), 14(b) and (c), 15(a)(with the deletion of the word “periodontal”) and 15(b),

The facts have also been proved to the satisfaction of the Committee in relation to the following Heads of Charge:

2, 3(a), (b), (c), (d) (amended to read: "...make a record of the area of translucency at LR5 or LR4") and 3(f), 6(a) and (b), 7, 9(b) and (c), 10(amended to read: "...by way of the provision of a bridge at UL2 to UR1 to replace UL1..."), 10 (c) and (d), 11(a) and (b), 12, 13(b)(with the deletion of the word "periodontal"), 13(c), 13(d)(ii), 13(d)(iii) and 13(d)(iv), 14 (a), 16(b), 17(a) and (b), 18, 19(c), 21, 22(a) and (b), 23(a), 23(b) and 23(c) (in respect of: 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(f), 3(g), 3(h)(as amended) and 3(i) 5, 6(a) and 6(b), 7, 9(a), 9(b) and 9(c) 10(c) and 10(d), 11(a) and 11(b), 13(a), 13(b), 13(c), 13(d)(ii), 13(d)(iii) and 13(d)(iv) 17(a) and 17(b), 18, 19(c) and 21

In relation to head of charge 16(b), which we have found proved, we could find nothing culpable in the conduct alleged.

Head of Charge 20 was withdrawn.

As previously announced because no evidence was offered on Head of Charge 19(g), this was dismissed and you have been found not guilty of serious professional misconduct in respect of those matters under Rule 10(1)(c).

At this stage the Committee has decided that such facts as have been proved would not be insufficient to support a finding of Serious Professional Misconduct and the case continues.

We move to Stage Two."

On 25th June 2008 the Chairman announced the determination as follows:

"Mr Abbassian,

The Committee has listened carefully to all the evidence provided to it, including particularly that handed in as D19 and D20 today, and has accepted the advice of the Legal Assessor.

The Committee determined that you breached the guidelines contained in Maintaining Standards 1997, the General Dental Council's ethical guidance in force at the relevant time, namely in the following instances:

- 2.1 Personal behaviour, in particular behaviour which reflects adversely on the profession. You have been dishonest. You argued with colleagues and staff within the hearing of patients. This type of behaviour undermines public confidence in the profession.
- 3.1 Acting in the best interest of patients – the professional relationship between the dentist and patient relies on trust and the assumption that a dentist will always act in the best interests of his patients. You betrayed that trust.
- 3.2 Providing a high standard of care – a patient is entitled to expect that a dentist will provide a high standard of care. You have not always provided a high standard of care.
- 3.6 Explaining treatment and cost – it is always the ultimate responsibility of the dentist to explain clearly to the patient the nature of his contract with them and in particular whether the patient has been accepted for treatment under the NHS or privately. You did not always do so.
- 3.7 Consent – a dentist must explain to the patient the treatment proposed, the risks involved and alternative options available. You did not always do so.

- 3.13 Handling complaints – if a patient has cause to complain about the service a dentist provides, every effort should be made to resolve the matter at the practice level.
- 4.3 Accurate and contemporaneous records – a dentist must always obtain a medical history of a patient before commencing treatment, and update and record the medical history at subsequent visits. You did not always do so.
- 4.7 Misleading claims – the Committee takes a very serious view of any misleading claim made by a dentist in relation to treatment. On occasion, you have misled your patients and the NHS.

Accordingly, we have found you guilty of serious professional misconduct.

In considering the appropriate sanction, the Committee has borne in mind that the purpose of these proceedings is not primarily punitive. It is to protect the public, uphold the reputation of the profession and maintain public confidence in the profession. In determining sanction, the Committee has applied the principle of proportionality and has also noted that your dishonesty falls at the lower end of the bracket for such behaviour. In addition, there was no evidence of a systematic and planned fraud. The Committee has considered all the options available to it, starting with the least serious.

Whilst making allowance for your poor command of the English language, the Committee found you an unsatisfactory witness, who was evasive and dishonest at times. In almost all cases where your evidence conflicted with that of witnesses called by the GDC, the Committee preferred such witnesses' evidence to yours. Moreover you have shown little insight or remorse. Your failure before today to offer to repay the patients who lost money to you is just one example of this. The Committee has, however, no wish to take you permanently away from treating patients. It has taken account of the effect of the deskilling produced by a lengthy period of suspension.

In the result this misconduct was serious and fell so far below acceptable standards that the Committee considered the only sufficient and proportionate sanction to be suspension for a period of 6 months with a review under the GDC Transitional Arrangements.

The Committee recommends that during your period of suspension you reflect daily on the way honesty and trust are at the very heart of a caring profession.

Specifically you are encouraged to demonstrate that you have carried out the following:

- repay your patients the sums suggested by your Counsel during his mitigation;
- to engage, as fully as you are permitted under your terms of suspension, with the ARM Programme;
- to agree with your Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative a comprehensive Personal Development Plan that will address ethical issues and the imperative of honesty in the practice of dentistry;
- to meet with the Postgraduate Dental Dean or his/her delegated representative, on a regular basis to discuss your progress towards achieving the aims set out in your Personal Development Plan. The frequency of your meetings is to be set by the Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative.

- to attend courses on *team working* and *dental practice management*
- under the guidance of your Local Audit/ Clinical Governance Officer, conduct retrospective audits of patients you have treated in the last year including:
  1. infection control and decontamination procedures
  2. the quality of your clinical records
  3. payment systems for dental care.

In order to provide a high standard of care, communication between dentist and patient is essential, as recognised in paragraph 10 of your proposed Development Plan. The Committee would recommend that you demonstrate by report, or by other reliable documentary evidence, that your English language skills are competent so as to satisfy this standard of care.

Accordingly the Committee directs the Registrar to suspend your name from the Dentists Register for 6 months with a review under the Transitional arrangements.

This Direction is that the name of Ardashir Abbassian will be suspended from the Dentists Register 28 days from the date on which notification of this determination will be deemed to have been served on you unless you exercise your right to appeal.”

At the resumed hearing on 16 December 2008 the Chairman announced the determination as follows:

“Mr Bradly,

The Committee has heard the submissions made by you on behalf of the General Dental Council. It has heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Mr Abbassian did not attend today’s proceedings, nor was he represented. The Committee was satisfied that all reasonable efforts were made to serve notice on him of this hearing and that he was in fact so served. A letter written on his behalf to Capsticks solicitors by Mr Stone, dated 18<sup>th</sup> November 2008, makes reference to the notice of hearing and states that Mr Abbassian ‘does not feel happy about returning to England...’. In a further letter written by Mr Abbassian’s wife, Mrs Abbassian, dated 28<sup>th</sup> November 2008, she stated that she had made attempts to persuade him to attend today’s hearing, but that his state of mind was such that he felt unable to come to a decision at this time. She further stated ‘ we therefore must leave the decision in the hands of the Professional Conduct Committee...’. The Committee noted a document signed by Mr Abbassian on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2007, witnessed by two persons stating:

*I hereby authorise my wife, Mrs Farideh Abbassian of the above address, and Mr Kerry Stone of ... to act on my behalf in my absence on all matters.*

Taking these factors into account, the Committee determined that it was fair and appropriate to proceed in Mr Abbassian’s absence.

On 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008, the Professional Conduct Committee suspended Mr Abbassian’s registration for a period of 6 months. That Committee determined that he had breached various specified guidelines contained in Maintaining Standards 1997, the General Dental Council’s ethical guidance in force at the relevant time. Further, they found him to be an evasive and dishonest witness at times.

They made recommendations aimed at assisting him in improving his ethics and practise.

Aside from repayments made to patients who were inappropriately charged, this Committee has seen no evidence of attempts made by Mr Abbassian to follow the recommendations as set out by the previous Committee.

The Committee is extremely concerned to note Mr Abbassian's disregard of the recommendations made by the previous Committee. The serious professional misconduct identified in June of this year remains unaddressed by him. In fact, the Committee notes from the letter written by Mr Stone on Mr Abbassian's behalf, that Mr Abbassian appears to still question the findings of the Professional Conduct Committee. This indicates a worrying lack of insight.

The Committee is of the view that Mr Abbassian's conduct still continues to fall far short of the standards expected of a dental professional.

In considering sanction, the Committee concluded that terminating the suspension would be inappropriate in this case as Mr Abbassian has not followed the recommendations made by the PCC in June this year. This Committee further considered that conditions would be inappropriate for the same reason. It also noted that in Mr Stone's letter of 18<sup>th</sup> November 2008, he indicates that Mr Abbassian would not be content with conditions upon his registration. As conditions require the cooperation and full engagement of a registrant, the Committee determined that they would not be workable in this case.

The Committee has decided to extend Mr Abbassian's suspension for a period of 10 months. It further determined that a review should take place before the end of that period. The period of ten months has been carefully chosen by the Committee in order to give Mr Abbassian sufficient time to make the necessary arrangements enabling him to follow the recommendations detailed below. These are necessary in order for Mr Abbassian to demonstrate to the reviewing Committee his suitability to return to practise in the United Kingdom.

The Committee expects Mr Abbassian:

- to engage, as fully as he is permitted under the terms of his suspension, with a program of similar content to the ARM Program;
- to agree with his Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative a comprehensive Personal Development Plan that will address ethical issues and the imperative of honesty in the practice of dentistry;
- to meet with the Postgraduate Dental Dean or his/her delegated representative, on a regular basis to discuss his progress towards achieving the aims set out in his Personal Development Plan. The frequency of his meetings is to be set by the Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative.
- to attend courses on *team working* and *dental practice management*
- under the guidance of his Local Audit/ Clinical Governance Officer, conduct retrospective audits of patients he treated in the year prior to his suspension, including:
  1. infection control and decontamination procedures
  2. the quality of his clinical records
  3. payment systems for dental care.

This Committee endorses the previous Committee's observations that communication between dentist and patient is essential in order to provide a high standard of care. It

therefore also recommends that he demonstrate by report, or by other reliable documentary evidence, that his English language skills are competent so as to satisfy this standard of care.

Accordingly the Committee directs the Registrar to suspend Mr Abbassian's name from the Dentists Register for 10 months with a review prior to the end of that period."

\*\*\*\*\*

"In the light of the findings above, the Committee has determined that for the protection of the public, immediate suspension of Mr Abbassian's registration is necessary.

The effect of this Direction is that the name of Ardashir Abbassian will be suspended from the Dentists Register with immediate effect."

At the resumed hearing on 4 September 2009 the Chairman announced the determination as follows:

"Mr Bradley,

Today the Committee has conducted the second review of the case of Ardeshir Abbassian. It has heard the submissions made by you on behalf of the General Dental Council. It has heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

As at the previous review hearing Mr Abbassian did not attend, nor was he represented. The Committee was satisfied that all reasonable efforts were made to serve notice on him of today's hearing and that he was so served. A letter written on his behalf to Capsticks solicitors by Mr Stone, dated 16<sup>th</sup> March 2009, stated that Mr Abbassian did not intend to be present at today's hearing.

The Committee therefore determined that it was fair and appropriate to proceed in Mr Abbassian's absence.

On 16<sup>th</sup> June 2008, the Professional Conduct Committee suspended Mr Abbassian's registration for a period of 6 months. That Committee determined that he had breached various specified guidelines contained in Maintaining Standards 1997, the General Dental Council's ethical guidance in force at the relevant time and that he had acted dishonestly. Further, they found him to have been an evasive and dishonest witness.

They made recommendations aimed at assisting him in improving his ethics and practice.

On 16<sup>th</sup> December 2008 the previous reviewing PCC stated that aside from repayments made to patients who were inappropriately charged, it had seen no evidence of attempts made by Mr Abbassian to follow the recommendations set out by the previous Committee.

This Committee notes that Mr Abbassian continues to disregard the recommendations made by the previous Committees. The serious professional misconduct identified in June 2008 remains unaddressed by him. The Committee notes from a letter written by Mr Stone on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2009, that Mr Abbassian still denies the allegations found proved by the Professional Conduct Committee. He also states that Mr Abbassian would ask that he be deregistered rather than be asked to fulfil the recommendations made. His lack of insight therefore continues and his conduct continues to fall far short of the standards expected of a dental professional.

The Committee has concluded that terminating the suspension would be inappropriate in this case as Mr Abbassian has still not followed the recommendations made by the PCC in June

2008 and appears to have no intention of doing so. This Committee further considered that conditions would be inappropriate for the same reason.

The Committee has decided to extend Mr Abbassian's suspension for a period of 12 months. It further determined that a review should take place before the end of that period. The period of 12 months would give Mr Abbassian time to reflect on the possibility of following the recommendations detailed below and implementing a plan to do so. These are necessary in order for Mr Abbassian to demonstrate to the reviewing Committee his suitability to return to practise in the United Kingdom.

The Committee expects Mr Abbassian:

- to engage, as fully as he is permitted under the terms of his suspension, with a programme of similar content to the ARM Program;
- to agree with his Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative a comprehensive Personal Development Plan that will address ethical issues and the imperative of honesty in the practice of dentistry;
- to meet with the Postgraduate Dental Dean or his/her delegated representative, on a regular basis to discuss his progress towards achieving the aims set out in his Personal Development Plan. The frequency of his meetings is to be set by the Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative.
- to attend courses on *team working* and *dental practice management*
- under the guidance of his Local Audit/ Clinical Governance Officer, conduct retrospective audits of patients he treated in the year prior to his suspension, including:
  1. infection control and decontamination procedures
  2. the quality of his clinical records
  3. payment systems for dental care.

This Committee endorses the previous Committees' observations that communication between dentist and patient is essential in order to provide a high standard of care. It therefore also recommends that he demonstrate by report, or by other reliable documentary evidence, that his English language skills are competent so as to satisfy this standard of care.

Accordingly the Committee directs the Registrar to suspend Mr Abbassian's name from the Dentists Register for 12 months with a review prior to the end of that period.

At the resumed hearing on 31 August 2010 the Chairman announced the determination as follows:

"Ms Bruce,

On 25th June 2008 Mr Abbassian was suspended for six months by the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) after it determined that he had fallen short of the standards expected of a dental professional and that he was guilty of serious professional misconduct. In addition to dishonesty in respect of National Health Service and private payments, there were proven instances of widespread failings in clinical practice.

That Committee recommended that Mr Abbassian reflect on the way honesty and trust are at the very heart of a caring profession. It also advised him to repay his patients the sums suggested by his Counsel during his mitigation, to engage with an Adverse Risk Member

Programme operated by his protection society, and to meet regularly with his Postgraduate Dean or his/her delegated representative and devise a comprehensive Personal Development Plan to address ethical issues and the imperative of honesty in the practice of dentistry. He was advised to attend courses on team working and dental practice management and obtain the guidance of his Local Audit/ Clinical Governance Officer to conduct retrospective audits of patients he had treated in the last year including:

1. infection control and decontamination procedures,
2. the quality of his clinical records, and
3. payment systems for dental care.

That Committee also recommended that Mr Abbassian demonstrate by report, or by other reliable documentary evidence, that his English language skills were adequate.

On 16 December 2008 the PCC reviewed the case. Mr Abbassian was not present, but written representations were made on his behalf by his wife and by Mr Kerry Stone acting as his lay representative. Apart from repayments made to patients who were inappropriately charged, that Committee noted that the serious professional misconduct identified in June of that year remained unaddressed by him. It further noted from a letter written by Mr Stone on Mr Abbassian's behalf, that Mr Abbassian appeared to still question the findings of the Professional Conduct Committee.

That Committee decided to extend Mr Abbassian's suspension for a period of 10 months. It reiterated the recommendations of the previous Committee.

On 4 September 2009 the PCC conducted the second review of the case.

Mr Abbassian did not attend and was not represented. The Committee noted his continued disregard of the recommendations and suspended his registration for 12 months.

Today this Committee has conducted a third review of this case. Mr Abbassian did not attend and was not represented. Apart from acknowledging notice of today's hearing, he did not make any representations regarding the recommendations made by the PCC.

The Committee notes that Mr Abbassian has engaged on a very limited basis with the process despite the extended opportunities afforded him by the PCC. Letters sent by Mr Stone have been focussed on confirming Mr Abbassian's intention not to attend or be represented at the hearings, or have disputed the findings made at the original hearing. The Committee has seen no evidence of any insight, and has concerns about public protection.

The Committee has determined that terminating the suspension would be inappropriate in this case as Mr Abbassian has still not followed the recommendations made by the PCC in June 2008 and, through Mr Stone, has previously declared his intention not to do so. This Committee further considered that conditions would be inappropriate for the same reason.

The Committee has decided to suspend Mr Abbassian's registration indefinitely.

Accordingly the Committee directs the Registrar to suspend indefinitely Mr Abbassian's name from the Dentists Register under section 27C(1)(d) of the Dentists Act 1984. This

means that his suspension will be reviewed if he requests a review when at least two years have elapsed since the date on which this direction takes effect.”