Dental Professionals Hearings Service

PUBLIC DETERMINATION

Professional Conduct Committee
Remitted hearing

26 – 28 October 2026

Name:	RAHMAN, Yasir
Registration number:	76339
Case number:	CAS-203534-F7K4Q1

General Dental Council:	Lydia Barnfather, Counsel Instructed by Claire Elam-Cooke, IHLPS
Registrant:	Present Represented by Stephen Brassington, Counsel Instructed by Priyani Singanayagam, MDDUS

Fitness to practise:	Remitted from High Court for sanction only
Outcome:	Erased
Immediate order:	Immediate suspension order

Committee members:	Val Evans (Chair, lay member) Annika Hindocha (Dentist member) Emma Haywood (Dental Care Professional member)
Legal adviser:	Alain Gogarty
Committee Secretary:	Sara Page

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing. The members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, conducted the hearing remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current General Dental Council (GDC) practice.

2. You were present at the hearing and represented by Mr Stephen Brassington, Counsel, instructed by MDDUS.

3. Ms Lydia Barnfather, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

Background

4. A Professional Conduct Committee hearing was held between 7 and 22 July 2025. The allegations under consideration by the original Professional Conduct Committee ('the original PCC') related to a pattern of conduct over a period extending from 2020 to early 2023 and concerned repeated inappropriate behaviour towards colleagues, principally junior female members of staff, as well as conduct towards patients.

5. The original PCC heard from five female witnesses and found that your fitness to practise was impaired on the ground of misconduct and on 22 July 2025, it imposed a sanction of suspension order for a period of six months, with a review.

6. On 8 September 2025, the GDC wrote to the Professional Standards Authority ('the PSA'), as the overarching regulator of health regulators, to notify it of the GDC's concerns with the determination. On the 6 October 2025, the PSA filed its Grounds of Appeal to the High Court and served them on the GDC on the 7 October 2025. On the 12 January 2026, the GDC confirmed they would not contest the appeal.

7. On 9 February 2026, the suspension was reviewed by the GDC Committee, and the suspension was terminated and substituted for an order of conditions for a period of 18-months, with an immediate order of conditions imposed.

8. On 5 March 2026, the appeal was heard at the High Court by Mr Justice Sweeting.

9. Ms Barnfather detailed the grounds of appeal, as follows:

    1) *The original PCC had erred in not finding some of the comments to be sexual in nature;*
    2) *The original PCC had erred in not finding some of the alleged conduct and comments not sexually motivated;*
    3) *(Not upheld);*
    4) *The original PCC had failed to appropriately address the evidence of deep-seated attitudinal problems;*
    5) *The original PCC erred in its approach to sanction as it was held that the original PCC had not grappled with the seriousness and persistence of the conduct, which also included discriminatory behaviour; and,*
    6) *The original PCC was wrong not to impose a sanction of erasure.*

10. Mr Justice Sweeting allowed the appeal on grounds 1), 2), 4), and 5). He did not allow it on ground 6). In relation to that ground, his ruling was that the sanction imposed fell outside the range of reasonable responses open to the original PCC. He directed that the question of sanction be determined before a freshly constituted committee.

11. The decision was handed down on 26 June 2026, in which Mr Justice Sweeting summarised the case as follows:

> *'The allegations related to a pattern of conduct over a period extending from 2020 to early 2023. They concerned repeated inappropriate behaviour towards colleagues, principally junior female members of staff, as well as conduct towards patients. After a 12-day hearing in July 2025, the Committee found the majority of the particulars proved.*
>
> *In substance, the Committee concluded that the Registrant had engaged in a course of behaviour which included:*
>
> - *Making frequent comments of a sexual or sexually suggestive nature to female colleagues, including asking questions about their sex lives and making explicit or provocative remarks;*
> - *Making demeaning and discriminatory comments about women, including remarks suggesting that women "belong in the kitchen";*
> - *Making racially discriminatory comments, including stating that he would "pour acid" on his daughter if she were in a relationship with a black man;*
> - *Engaging in inappropriate physical contact with a colleague; and*
> - *Behaving discourteously towards patients.*
>
> *The Committee characterised the conduct as serious professional misconduct, involving inappropriate, sexual and discriminatory behaviour, and a serious falling-short of professional standards.'*

Purpose of today's hearing

12. This hearing has been convened before a freshly constituted committee to reconsider the matter of sanction, in line with the directions detailed by Mr Justice Sweeting, as follows:

> *'The matter is to be remitted to a freshly constituted panel of the […] Professional Conduct Committee.*
>
> *1) That panel is to be provided with:*
>
> *a) The evidence which was placed before the original panel.*
> *b) The reasons and transcripts from the hearing before the original panel, with the decisions about allegations 1(e), 1 (l), 1(n) and 1(p), and about Sanction Redacted.*
> *c) A copy of the Judgment to this Order.*
> *d) A copy of this Order and Schedule.*
> *e) Any other evidence adduced by the [GDC] or [the Registrant], subject to the requirements of fairness and relevance.*
>
> *2) The panel is to decide upon the appropriate sanction, taking into account:*

a) *The findings of fact, the findings in relation to misconduct, and the findings in relation to impairment made by the original panel, and as as* [sic] *substituted by this Order.*
b) *The reasons for allowing this appeal as set out in the Judgment to this Order.*
c) *Any fresh evidence which has been admitted subject to the requirements of relevance and fairness.'*

13. Having considered the original PCC's decision as to facts, misconduct and impairment, and as substituted by the findings of Mr Justice Sweeting set out at paragraphs 2a) and b) as follows:

a) *The findings that allegation 1(l) was not of a sexual nature and did not amount to professional misconduct are quashed, and replaced with findings that the comments were of a sexual nature, and amounted to professional misconduct.*

b) *The findings that allegations 1(e), 1(n) and 1(p) were not sexually motivated are quashed, and replaced with findings that these comments were sexually motivated and amount to professional misconduct.*

14. The Committee is required to determine what sanction to impose.

Evidence

15. Along with all the documentary evidence and transcripts from the initial PCC hearing, the Committee had regard to five bundles of documents, which included but was not limited to the following:

- Sealed High Court order, dated 29 June 2026;
- Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment, dated 26 June 2026;
- Written reflective statement, dated 9 October 2026;
- Personal Development Plans (PDP), various dates;
- Continuing Professional Development (CPD), various dates; and,
- Additional testimonials on your behalf, various dates.

Submissions

16. In accordance with Rule 20 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2006, the Committee heard submissions from Ms Barnfather, on behalf of the GDC, and Mr Brassington's submissions, on your behalf, in relation to the matter of sanction.

17. Ms Barnfather submitted on behalf of the GDC that you have not demonstrated any further insight in the defence bundle provided to the Committee for the purposes of today's hearing. She referred to your written reflective statement in which she submitted that you have not accepted the findings of the original PCC and your position since the initial hearing has not changed.

18. Ms Barnfather reminded the Committee of its overarching objective to protect, promote, and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public, which includes ensuring proper

professional standards and conduct for dental professionals. She referred the Committee to the relevant guidance document and invited it to carefully determine the appropriate and proportionate sanction. Ms Barnfather also invited the Committee to have particular regard to paragraphs 152 – 160 and 167 – 174 of Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment. She submitted that the imposition of either a reprimand or conditional registration would be nothing short of perverse in the circumstances. Ms Barnfather submitted that a suspension of any duration would be insufficient and reminded the Committee that the High Court considered that a suspension of six months was manifestly insufficient due to the gravamen, multiplicity and persistent attitudinal concerns which she submitted are highly damaging to the profession, showing a mindset and attitude that is incompatible with continued membership of the dental profession. She submitted that this case involved an imbalance of power and an abuse of trust of patients and members of the dental team.

19. Ms Barnfather reminded the Committee of the requirement to assess the cumulative gravity, the repeated nature of the conduct sustained over a significant period of time, and the abuse of trust. She referred the Committee to Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment at paragraph 153 as follows:

> *'In particular, the Committee failed adequately to grapple with the cumulative gravity of the conduct it had found proved. That conduct was neither isolated nor peripheral. It consisted of repeated inappropriate, sexualised and discriminatory behaviour over a sustained period, principally towards junior female colleagues. It also included racist remarks of a particularly disturbing character and conduct towards patients which fell short of the standards expected of a registered practitioner. As … submitted, on behalf of the PSA, this was a pattern of behaviour, not a misjudgement in specific circumstances, and was indicative of* [un]*acceptable attitudes towards women and other races.'.* [sic]

20. Ms Barnfather outlined that Mr Justice Sweeting concluded that the original PCC had not considered the breadth and persistence of the conduct and had not properly evaluated the attitudinal aspect of it. She reminded the Committee that the original PCC was also criticised for placing too much weight on limited evidence of insight and remediation when it had properly concluded that your insight was only partial and there was a risk of repetition. Whilst it is not open to the Committee to reassess the matter of impairment, she submitted that there is nothing before the Committee to lead to any recalibration of impairment in respect of your insight. Indeed, she stated that as a result of the substituted findings by Mr Justice Sweeting, the findings were now even more serious. In considering all the information before it, Ms Barnfather invited the Committee to consider erasing you from the Register as public confidence would not be protected by any lesser sanction and that this is the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case.

21. Mr Brassington, on your behalf, reminded the Committee of the need to consider the risk of harm to the public and the wider public interest and to consider the matter of proportionality in coming to its decision on sanction and were the scales to tip over into punishment, this would be disproportionate and unlawful. To assist the Committee, he referred to the Committee to the evidence provided on your behalf and when assessing the gravamen, the breadth, and the multiplicity of the original PCC's findings, it ought to attach the appropriate weight to that evidence, including the testimonials provided on your behalf, and any mitigation put forward.

22. Mr Brassington reminded the Committee that you have been through the original PCC hearing, a PCC review of the original sanction, the High Court proceedings and that you have remained adamant and steadfast that you did not do the things accused of beyond limited admissions

you gave to the original PCC. However, he submitted that this does not render you a man who has no insight into the misconduct found proved and that you have demonstrated why such behaviour is wrong and how such conduct can be avoided in the future. Mr Brassington told the Committee that you have been entirely humbled by this process and appear today as a broken registrant who maintains his denials of the misconduct found proved.

23. Mr Brassington submitted that whilst the views expressed may be repugnant, reprehensible, unappealing, unattractive and archaic, that they could not be properly assessed as being the most serious type of misconduct, with no evidence of sexual touching. He submitted that although the members of staff who gave evidence in this case may be considered to be junior, none of the employees who reported the misconduct were vulnerable and did not always take offence.

24. Mr Brassington submitted that there is no suggestion that the misconduct escalated over time, despite having taken place over a period of more than two years, and that there is no evidence that it has occurred previously or since the findings of the original PCC. He further submitted that you have demonstrated significant insight in your *"searingly honest"* reflective statement and that you are capable of remedial change, demonstrated by your exhaustive CPD, showing that the misconduct found proved would not be repeated. He stated that you are a man of faith who accepts that your faith may have shaped some of the opinion you may hold, but who undertakes charity work, for which you must be commended.

25. In relation to insight, Mr Brassington submitted that it would be wrong to equate your position namely that you maintain your position on the disputed conduct and deny sexual motivation with a lack of insight. He stated that you have been consistently adamant that you do not accept what you are alleged to have done and was then found proved but that to maintain your denials does not mean you have no insight. He submitted that whilst you maintain your position you have, by way of reflection (dated 9 October 2026) and focused CPD, PDP, and testimonials, shown further insight into your misconduct.

26. Mr Brassington invited the Committee to find that as hurtful as the words used might be, there is no shred of evidence that anyone has come to physical harm, no evidence that you have treated a female patient, or black patients, any differently to anyone else. He also provided the Committee with information relating to your current employment and financial situation.

27. In those circumstances, Mr Brassington submitted that the Committee could be satisfied that to suspend your registration, for whatever period was thought necessary, would allow you time to show further reflection and remediation if required, then allowing you to return to useful and unrestricted practice.

Decision and reasons on sanction

28. In coming to its decision on sanction, the Committee considered what action, if any, to take in relation to your registration. It took into account the relevant GDC document, *'Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance 2016* (revised December 2020)', referred to hereafter as 'the ISG'.

29. The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate and appropriate and, although not intended to be punitive, may have that effect. It also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who referred to relevant case law to assist the Committee in coming to its decision.

30. In coming to its decision, the Committee had careful regard to the original PCC's findings in relation to misconduct and impairment and Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment. It took into account that the misconduct was characterised by Mr Justice Sweeting as consisting of *'…repeated inappropriate, sexualised and discriminatory behaviour over a sustained period, principally towards junior female colleagues. It also included racist remarks of a particularly disturbing character and conduct towards patients which fell short of the standards expected of a registered practitioner'* and that it was '… *not a misjudgement in specific circumstances, and was indicative of* [un]*acceptable attitudes towards women and other races.'*

Insight

31. The Committee carefully considered the submissions made by Ms Barnfather and Mr Brassington in relation to your ongoing denials of the original PCC's findings on misconduct. It also had regard to Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment in which he stated the original PCC had placed excessive weight on the limited insight you had demonstrated in July 2025 and directed that the Committee carefully consider the misconduct as a whole when considering the matter of insight.

32. The Committee acknowledged that whilst you are entitled to maintain your denials of the misconduct found proven, the assessment of your insight into the behaviour found proved is more difficult to determine given your current position in relation to the conduct and sexual motivation. It took into account that the original PCC found that your insight in July 2025 was developing and that you had not demonstrated sufficiently detailed examples of what you had learned and how you would prevent similar conduct in the future. In this regard, it looked carefully at the documentation you have provided for the purposes of today's hearing.

33. In your written reflection, you stated:

> *'I acknowledge that the findings of fact, misconduct and impairment, including those substituted by the High Court, form the basis of this hearing. I accept the High Court ruling as the basis on which the Committee must proceed and am not asking this Committee to reconsider those findings. That acknowledgement is not an admission that I did the things I disputed, or that I accept the disputed allegations as true…*
>
> *During my suspension, I engaged with reflective learning and remediation. The five categories below retain the structure of my February 2026 statement and address the findings collectively as well as individually. My position has not significantly changed; this amendment clarifies the distinction between acknowledging the findings for this hearing and admitting disputed conduct, while addressing the concerns identified by the High Court.*
>
> *…I maintain my position on the disputed allegations and do not admit sexual motivation in any of the conduct alleged against me.'*

34. You stated in your reflective statement that you understood why such findings raise serious concerns about public protection, including the protection of colleagues, professional standards and confidence in the profession. You expressed that you are committed to ensuring that no similar concerns arise again in the future and detailed how you intended to achieve this. Further, you stated that if you are permitted to return to practice, you are committed to maintaining respectful professional relationships.

35. In assessing your insight, the Committee did not only consider your written reflective statement, but all the information before it today and determined that your insight is not sufficiently developed as you have not demonstrated that you have a proper understanding of the seriousness of the matters found proved.

Remediation

36. The Committee noted that in your written reflection, dated 9 October 2026, you had detailed what remediative steps you have taken to address the original PCC's findings on misconduct, including targeted CPD addressing equality and diversity, professionalism, safeguarding and inclusive communication. You stated that to ensure such conduct does not recur, you are committed to regularly self-monitoring and to actively promoting a culture of empathy, respect, and professionalism within the practice.

Testimonials

37. You have provided 13 positive testimonials from dental colleagues, friends and peers to be considered by the Committee. The Committee noted that of all the testimonials, most do not directly address the matters found proved by the original PCC. Whilst many of the testimonials speak highly of you as a dentist, one directly addressed the misconduct found proved. The referee, described as a friend, professional colleague and fellow dentist, stated:

> *'I appreciate that conversations, particularly when people are under pressure or emotions are running high, can sometimes result in things being said that may later be interpreted differently or taken out of the context in which they were originally said. Dr Rahman has a dry and sometimes mischievous sense of humour, which I have known and appreciated throughout the many years I have known him. I can understand how a comment made in jest, particularly during a heated or informal conversation, could potentially be interpreted differently when removed from the context and circumstances in which it was originally made.'*

38. Other testimonials depicted you as a good dentist who works well with patients and colleagues, but this did not address the original PCC's findings that you had behaved in a discriminatory and inappropriate way towards junior members of staff and had engaged in sexually motivated conduct.

Deep-seated personality and professional attitudinal problems

39. The Committee noted paragraph 154 of Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment, as follows:

> *'Notwithstanding its findings, the Committee's reasoning at the sanction stage did not sufficiently reflect the breadth and persistence of the misconduct. It drew distinctions, particularly between conduct which was sexually motivated and that which was not, which risked minimising the overall seriousness of the case. Further, although the Committee recognised that the behaviour was "attitudinal", it did not adequately evaluate the nature and significance of that attitudinal failing when determining the appropriate sanction.'*

40. In considering whether the 'attitudinal' nature of the findings were deep-seated personality and/or professional attitudinal problems, the Committee bore in mind that there was a similarity in the nature of the inappropriate pattern of behaviours and comments made and that it

appeared that these were directed at junior members of female staff and included one elderly female patient and a black male patient. It was apparent from the evidence before the original PCC that these comments were considered to be offensive by a number of the dental nurses who attended to give oral evidence. The comments in particular were repeated with some frequency over the two to three year period in which they occurred and included a range of sexual, sexually motivated, discriminatory and racist remarks. The Committee noted that multiple separate comments, remarks and behaviours had been charged and found proved in this case. When considering the misconduct as a whole, the Committee concluded that this was indicative of a person who held the beliefs of the comments made and they were not just made as provocative remarks and were evidence of a deep-seated attitudinal issue. This was clearly evident by the persistent nature of the sexualised and discriminatory remarks made to junior staff and to patients, and a lack of understanding of professional boundaries.

Decision on sanction

41. The Committee took into account that it is required to reconsider the question of sanction in light of Mr Justice Sweeting's judgment which included substituted findings set out earlier in this document. The Committee had regard to the original PCC's findings on misconduct and impairment in coming to its decision. The Committee must determine what sanction is necessary to satisfy the statutory objective, having proper regard to the gravity of the misconduct as a whole, the nature of any attitudinal concerns, and the evidence as to insight, remediation and risk of repetition. The Committee also had regard to the ISG, last revised in December 2020.

42. The Committee took into account the following mitigating features:

- evidence of good conduct following the incident(s) in question, particularly any remedial action;
- evidence of previous good character;
- some evidence of insight/apology given;
- evidence of steps taken to avoid a repetition; and
- no financial gain on the part of the Registrant.

43. The Committee also took into account the following aggravating features:

- risk of emotional harm to a patient or another;
- breach of trust;
- the involvement of a vulnerable patient or other vulnerable individual;
- misconduct sustained or repeated over a period of time; and,
- limited insight.

44. The Committee bore in mind that the original PCC found that your fitness to practise was impaired on the grounds of public protection and being otherwise in the public interest, finding that you had breached a number of the GDC's 'Standards for the Dental Team', indicating there remained a risk of repetition of the inappropriate and unprofessional behaviour in the future.

45. The Committee noted that the issue in this case is what is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose in light of all of the above. Clearly, to take no further action, impose a reprimand or conditional registration would not adequately protect the public or address the

public interest considerations. Realistically therefore, the issue is whether or not to impose a suspension order or an order of erasure.

46. The Committee then went on to consider whether a suspension would be the appropriate sanction. The ISG states suspension may be suitable where most of the following factors are present:

- *there is evidence of repetition of the behaviour;*
- *the Registrant has not shown insight and/or poses a significant risk of repeating 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;*
- *there is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems (which might make erasure the appropriate order).*

47. In considering Mr Brassington's submission that during the three year period between the conduct having taken place and today, there has been no repetition of conduct of a similar nature and there have been no previous reports of similar conduct prior to these matters being brought to light. However, the Committee considered that these are extremely serious matters and has concluded that your insight is not sufficiently developed as you have not demonstrated that you have a proper understanding of the seriousness or impact of the matters found proved.

48. Further, the Committee determined that there is evidence of deep-seated attitudinal problems. Whilst such problems may be more difficult to remediate compared to clinical matters, you have not done so. This Committee noted the findings of the original PCC regarding your level of insight, as set out in paragraphs 60 – 68 of their decision, of which paragraph 66 sates:

> *'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.'*

49. Having considered all the fresh evidence before it, the Committee concludes that your insight remains *'partial',* therefore it cannot be said that your misconduct is unlikely to be repeated.

50. Having regard to the cumulative gravity of the misconduct, its breadth and persistence, and lack of full insight, the Committee concluded that a suspension order would not adequately address the public protection issues identified nor satisfy the wider public interest. This includes declaring and upholding proper standards and maintaining public confidence in the profession. A reasonable and fully informed member of the public would be shocked and troubled to learn that a dentist who has behaved in the way set out in the original PCC's decision, who has not demonstrated full insight into his misconduct, was permitted to practise. The nature, gravity, and persistence of the comments are so serious that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if you were allowed to remain on the Register.

51. In considering erasure, the ISG states removal from the Register may be suitable where most of the following factors are present:

- *serious departure(s) from the relevant professional standards;*
- *where serious harm to patients or other persons has occurred, either deliberately or through incompetence;*
- *where a continuing risk of serious harm to patients or other persons is identified;*
- *the abuse of a position of trust or violation of the rights of patients, particularly if involving vulnerable persons;*
- *convictions or findings of a sexual nature, including involvement in any form of child pornography;*
- *serious dishonesty, particularly where persistent or covered up; and,*
- *a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of actions or their consequences.*

52. The Committee has already indicated that your misconduct was a serious and significant departure from the professional standards and is conduct that is unacceptable from a registered professional. It acknowledged that the original PCC found that a number of the witnesses had been offended by your conduct and whilst there was little evidence of serious harm to those you directed the offensive and discriminatory remarks, it was obvious that comments and behaviours of such a nature would cause harm or offence. If you were to make comments or behave in such a way in the future, it would pose a risk of harm to members of the team and/or patients.

53. The Committee found that findings of sexual and discriminatory misconduct are particularly damaging to the profession and whilst the concerns in this case do not amount to being the most serious sexual misconduct, persistent comments and behaviours would be viewed as harmful when accompanied by a lack of meaningful insight.

54. The Committee found that you have not demonstrated full insight into your misconduct notwithstanding the passage of time since the original PCC's decision. This demonstrates a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of the matters found proved against you. Whilst you have undertaken CPD in an attempt to remediate your misconduct, there is no evidence before the Committee that these courses have developed into a deeper and more meaningful understanding of the seriousness of the matters at the heart of this case or that it has been embedded as such that it would prevent you from behaving similarly in the future.

55. Taking all of the above into account, the Committee concluded that erasure is the only sanction that would appropriately address the misconduct in this case and send the public and the profession a clear message about the standards expected of a registered dental professional. To adequately protect the public and the wider public interest, nothing short of removal from the Register would be sufficient.

56. In reaching this decision, the Committee has taken into account the impact professionally and financially on you but has determined that the need to protect the public and the wider public interest outweighs your own interest.

57. Balancing all these factors, the Committee directs that your name be erased from the Register.

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

Decision and reasons on immediate order

59. Ms Barnfather informed the Committee that the order of erasure does not come into effect until the end of the appeal period or, if an appeal is lodged, until it has been disposed of. The appeal period expires 28 days after the date on which the notification of the determination is served upon you. In this regard, she referred the Committee to the ISG, specifically paragraphs 6.35 and 6.38. She submitted that given the public interest concerns identified in the substantive determination on sanction, it is necessary and consistent with that decision for an immediate order of suspension to now be imposed on your registration.

60. Mr Brassington did not make any submissions on the matter of an immediate order.

61. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

62. Having carefully considered its reasons for imposing the order of erasure, the Committee was satisfied that an immediate order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. To do otherwise would be incompatible with its earlier findings.

63. The immediate suspension will remain in place until any appeal is disposed of or, if no appeal is lodged, the substantive erasure will replace the immediate order 28 days after you are sent the decision of the Committee in writing.

64. The Committee confirmed that any interim order currently in place on your registration is hereby revoked following the imposition of the substantive order of erasure.

65. That concludes this determination.