

HEARING HELD IN PUBLIC

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

7 to 8 April 2026
(7 April non-sitting day)

Name: SINGH, Deepak

Registration number: 264962

Case number: CAS-210378-C6W1G0

General Dental Council: Andrew Molloy, Counsel
Instructed by Carla Marie Clough, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Represented by Vivienne Tanchel, Counsel
Instructed by Fadzai Smith, RPC Solicitors

Outcome: Application to withdraw the charge and offer no evidence
accepted

Committee members: Marnie Hayward (Chair, Dental Care Professional Member)
Gezala Umar (Dentist Member)
Rachel Onikosi (Lay Member)

Legal Adviser: Judith Walker

Committee Secretary: Lola Bird

Mr Singh,

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee hearing, which is being conducted remotely with all participants attending by Microsoft Teams video-link.
2. The hearing was scheduled to begin yesterday, 7 April 2026, but did not formally commence until today, 8 April 2026, with the Committee having utilised the first scheduled day for reading the case papers, which were provided to the Committee that day.
3. You are represented at these proceedings by Ms Vivienne Tanchel, Counsel. The Case Presenter for the GDC is Mr Andrew Molloy, Counsel.

Preliminary Matters

4. Mr Molloy told the Committee that he had two preliminary matters to address pertaining to the charge in this case. He stated that both his preliminary applications would be made pursuant to Rule 18 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*. Rule 18, which deals with 'Amendment of the charge', states that:

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.

(2) Before making any amendment under paragraph (1), a Practice Committee shall consider any representations from the parties.

First preliminary application to amend the charge by inserting a date

5. The charge to which Mr Molloy referred was set out as follows in the Notice of Hearing sent to you, dated 6 March 2026:

"That being registered as a dentist:

1. *You failed to be registered correctly with the Care Quality Commission, including:
 - a. *providing CQC legally regulated activity; Diagnostic and Screening Procedures, whilst not being registered to provide such activities.*
 - b. *Maintaining a correct and up to date address.**

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

6. Mr Molloy's first application was to amend the charge by inserting the date '9 September 2023' at the beginning of head of charge 1, so that it would read:

1. On 9 September 2023, you failed to be registered correctly with the Care Quality Commission, including:

7. It was Mr Molloy's submission that this first proposed amendment could be made without causing any injustice to either party in this case, and that it would assist to focus the timeframe on which the charge is based.

Second preliminary application to withdraw the charge in its entirety

8. Mr Molloy's second preliminary application was more substantive. He applied to amend the charge by withdrawing it in its entirety.

9. By way of an overview, Mr Molloy referred the Committee to the written opening note dated 6 April 2026 that he had provided in respect of this application. The background to the matter being that on 2 October 2023, the GDC received a complaint from a representative of a patient regarding treatment that was said to have been provided to the patient at a dental practice ('the Practice').

10. During the initial investigation, the GDC caseworker identified further concerns relating the Practice's Care Quality Commission (CQC) registration status. It was noted that the Practice appeared to be undertaking 'diagnostic and screening procedures', at an address other than that registered with the CQC. Clarification was sought as to whether these activities fell within the scope of its existing CQC registration. The Practice's registration at the time appeared to be limited to the 'provision of remote service' and the 'treatment of disease, disorder, or injury'.

11. The only matters referred to this Committee were in relation to registration with the CQC, as reflected in the charge brought against you, namely the alleged provision of CQC regulated activities whilst not being registered to do so, and the alleged failure to maintain a correct and up to date address with the CQC.

12. In explaining the GDC's position, Mr Molloy stated that individual witness statements had recently been provided by you and by Witness 1, the owner of another dental practice ('the Clinic'). Mr Molloy stated that these witness statements had provided fresh information regarding your practice, namely that at the material time, you were operating under an Associate Agreement with Witness 1 at the premises of the Clinic.

13. Mr Molloy drew the Committee's attention to main expert witness report dated 4 December 2025 prepared for the GDC by Mr Nikolai Stankiewicz, a registered dentist and with expertise in Clinical Governance. Mr Molloy highlighted that in giving his initial opinion in this case, Mr Stankiewicz had stated in his main report that, should further information come to light that indicated that you were working at the Clinic in another capacity other than Director of the Practice, such as a self-employed associate working for another provider who was the CQC registered legal entity, this might change his expert opinion.

14. Mr Molloy told the Committee that on receipt of the disclosure of your case, Mr Stankiewicz was provided with the fresh information included in your witness statement and that of Witness 1. Having reviewed the additional information provided, Mr Stankiewicz produced an addendum expert

report dated 2 April 2026, in which he gave the opinion that the evidence did not support the factual allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing.

15. Mr Molloy submitted that it was for these reasons that the GDC was making an application to withdraw the charge in its entirety, having the effect of offering no evidence and bringing the hearing to a close. It was Mr Molloy's submission that no further or better evidence can be obtained. He stated that it was neither in the interests of justice to delay a resolution of these proceedings nor to sanction you.

16. In inviting the Committee to accede to the application to withdraw the charge in its entirety, Mr Molloy referred the Committee to the relevant case law set out in his written opening note, including in relation to regulators having the right to offer no evidence.

Submissions made on your behalf in response to the preliminary applications

17. Ms Tanchel did not oppose the first application made by the GDC to insert the date '9 September 2023' into the charge. She stated that the evidence in relation to the date of the relevant appointment is set out in the documentation before the Committee.

18. With regard to the GDC's second application to withdraw the charge in its entirety, Ms Tanchel stated that she had no substantial observations to make. However, she reminded the Committee that the burden of proving the allegations rests with the GDC, and by its own admission the Council has stated that it cannot discharge that burden.

The Committee's decisions on the preliminary applications – 8 April 2026

19. The Committee considered all the evidence placed before it. The evidence provided to the Committee included your witness statement dated 13 March 2026, that of Witness 1 dated 5 March 2026, and a witness statement dated 4 December 2025 from Witness 2, a CQC Registration Manager, along with a number of associated exhibits. The Committee also received the main and addendum expert reports of Mr Stankiewicz.

20. The Committee took account of the submissions made in respect of the preliminary applications by Mr Molloy on behalf of the GDC and by Ms Tanchel on your behalf. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, including in relation to its power under Rule 18. The Legal Adviser emphasised that the relevant case law makes clear that where no evidence is offered by the regulator, the Committee should itself carefully consider the evidence and reach its own decision as to the charge. The Legal Adviser also reminded the Committee that the burden of proof is on the GDC and that you are not required to prove anything.

Decision on first preliminary application to amend the charge by inserting a date

21. In reaching its decision on this first preliminary application, the Committee took into account that there was evidence before it to indicate that 9 September 2023 was the relevant date. It was the view of the Committee that including the date in the charge was an important factor, providing focus to the alleged matters and making clear that they relate to a single event.

22. Accordingly, the Committee was satisfied that this proposed amendment could be made without causing either party any injustice. It therefore acceded to the GDC's first preliminary application.

23. The amended charge considered by the Committee for the purposes of the second preliminary application was as follows:

"That being registered as a dentist:

1. On 9 September 2023, you failed to be registered correctly with the Care Quality Commission, including:

a. providing CQC legally regulated activity; Diagnostic and Screening Procedures, whilst not being registered to provide such activities.

b. Maintaining a correct and up to date address.

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

Decision on second preliminary application to withdraw the amended charge in its entirety

24. In respect of head of charge 1(a), the Committee noted that the opinion initially given by Mr Stankiewicz in his main expert report suggested that there may have been issues regarding your undertaking of CQC regulated activities, as the Director of the Practice, whilst not being registered to provide such activities. However, in his addendum report, Mr Stankiewicz revised his opinion, following his review of the additional evidence provided as part of your case. Mr Stankiewicz's conclusion is now that the evidence before the Committee does not support the allegations set out in the charge.

25. The Committee had regard to the additional evidence considered by the GDC's expert, which includes the witness statement of Witness 1, who confirms that at the material time of the allegations in this case, you were working as an Associate Dentist for the Clinic. Witness 1 provided with his witness statement a copy of your Associate Agreement with him, which he said you worked under from September 2019 until August 2024. Furthermore, that in working under that agreement, you were covered by the CQC registration of the Clinic, which is an entity that was registered to provide diagnostic and screening procedures, amongst other regulated activities. In your witness statement, you state that no consultations took place outside of appropriate CQC registration.

26. It was the conclusion of the Committee, having considered documentation provided to it, including the most recent report of the GDC's expert witness, that there is no evidence to support head of charge 1(a), namely that on 9 September 2023, you provided CQC legally regulated activity; Diagnostic and Screening Procedures, whilst not being registered to provide such activities.

27. The Committee also concluded that there is no evidence to support the associated allegation at head of charge 1(b), given the information that you were practicing under your Associate

Agreement with the Clinic, and Witness 1's evidence is the Clinic was appropriately registered with the CQC. Whilst the Committee took into account your involvement with two other dental practices, including the Practice at which you were Director, it did not consider that information relevant, given your Associate Agreement with the Clinic.

28. In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that the GDC had fully and properly investigated all matters, and that there are no other reasonable lines of inquiry. Accordingly, having had regard to the merits of this case and the fairness of the proceedings, the Committee determined that the amended charge could be withdrawn in its entirety. The Committee was satisfied that no injustice would be caused to either party from this course of action. It noted that the GDC has confirmed that it offers no evidence in support of what was alleged. The Committee agreed that it would not be in the interests of justice to delay the resolution of these proceedings or to sanction you. It also had regard to its duty to act expeditiously in the public interest.

29. The Committee therefore accedes to the GDC's second preliminary application. The amended charge is withdrawn in its entirety, having the effect of the GDC offering no evidence. This now brings these proceedings against you to a close.

30. That concludes this determination.