

## PUBLIC HEARING

### Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

4 to 6 August 2025  
and  
13 and 14 October 2025

**Name:** CRAIG, John Geater

**Registration number:** 157838

**Case number:** CAS-209177

---

**General Dental Council:** Amy Woolfson, counsel  
Instructed by Carla Marie Clough, IHLPS

**Registrant:** Present  
Not represented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of misconduct

**Outcome:** Erased with Immediate Suspension

**Duration:** N/A

**Immediate order:** Immediate suspension order

---

**Committee members:** Matthew King (Dentist) (Chair)  
Karen Suarez (Dental Care Professional)  
Miranda Carruthers-Watt (Lay)

**Legal Adviser:** Justin Gau

**Committee Secretary:** Gareth Llewellyn

## **Determination on preliminary matters – 4 August 2025**

Mr Craig

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being held remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice.
2. You are present and are not represented. Amy Woolfson of counsel, instructed by Carla Marie Clough of the General Dental Council's (GDC's) In-House Legal Presentation Service (IHLPS), appears for the GDC.

### **The charge**

3. The charge that you face at this hearing reads as follows:

*"That being a registered dental care professional:-*

*1. On 17 June 2022 you provided false information to the Professional Conduct Committee in that:*

*a. You stated that NHS Education for Scotland ("NES") had notified you that they were unable to assist you on the basis you were not an NHS employee.*

*2. Your conduct in relation to 1a above was:*

*a. Misleading*

*b. Dishonest*

*And that by reason of the facts alleged, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct."*

### **Hearing to be part-held in private**

4. Ms Woolfson invited the Committee to hold part of the hearing in private in accordance with Rule 53 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). Ms Woolfson submitted that there may be reference to aspects of your private life, and that such matters should be heard in private. The Committee, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, determined to accede to the application in order to protect your private life.

## **Findings of fact – 6 August 2025 (as amended on 13 October 2025)**

### **Background to the case and summary of allegations**

5. The allegations giving rise to this hearing arise out of information that you are said to have provided to the PCC when appearing before it at a resumed hearing on 17 June 2022. That resumed hearing was convened to review an earlier direction of conditional registration first imposed by the PCC on 28 November 2018.
6. The direction of conditional registration, first imposed on 28 November 2018, replaced a previous direction of suspended registration imposed by the PCC at the conclusion of its initial hearing of inquiry in November 2016. At that initial hearing in November 2016 the PCC determined that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct. The facts which gave rise to the finding of misconduct included findings of dishonest conduct relating to your record-keeping, and in relation to your contact with, and about, a patient.

7. The direction of conditional registration first imposed on 28 November 2018 was subsequently reviewed and extended by the PCC at intervening resumed hearings held on 27 November 2019 and 2 December 2020. The conditions were then extended on a further occasion by the PCC on 10 December 2021, with variations made to the conditions. The variations related to a requirement that you meet with the Postgraduate Dental Dean or Director, or a nominated deputy, to develop your personal development plan (PDP).
8. At the resumed hearing of the PCC on 17 June 2022 the PCC reviewed the conditions to which your registration was subject. As referred to above, those conditions, amongst other requirements, required you to develop a PDP by meeting, either virtually or in person, with the Postgraduate Dental Dean or Director.
9. It is specifically alleged that, at a resumed hearing that took place on 17 June 2022, you stated in oral submissions to the PCC that NHS Education for Scotland (NES) had informed you that they were unable to assist you with your PDP because you were not an NHS employee. The GDC alleges that this statement was misleading and dishonest.

### **Evidence**

10. The Committee has been provided with documentary material in relation to the heads of charge that you face, including the witness statement and documentary exhibits of Christopher Clark, who is a caseworker in the GDC's Fitness to Practise team with knowledge of the case and who sets out the history of your fitness to practise proceedings, including in relation to the conditions in place on your registration; the witness statements and documentary exhibits of Yinny Grainger, who is a paralegal in the GDC's In-House Legal Presentation Service, who in particular produces a copy of the transcript of the proceedings of the PCC resumed hearing that took place on 17 June 2022; the witness statement and documentary exhibits of Gillian Nevin, who is an Assistant Postgraduate Dental Dean with NHS Education for Scotland (NES), who assisted you with the PDP and continuing professional development (CPD) aspects of the requirements of your conditional registration; and your previous observations on the charges that you face at an earlier stage, namely the Case Examiners stage, of the GDC's proceedings.
11. The Committee heard oral evidence from two of the three GDC witnesses referred to above, namely Christopher Clark and Gillian Nevin, and from you.

### **Committee's findings of fact**

12. The Committee has taken into account all the evidence presented to it, both written and oral. It has considered the submissions made by Ms Woolfson on behalf of the GDC and those made by you. The Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020).
13. The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee is mindful that the burden of proof lies with the GDC, and has considered the heads of charge against the civil standard of proof, that is to say, the balance of probabilities. The Committee has considered each head of charge separately.
14. I will now announce the Committee's findings in relation to each head of charge:

1.	<i>On 17 June 2022 you provided false information to the Professional Conduct Committee in that:</i>
----	--

<p>1. (a)</p>	<p><i>You stated that NHS Education for Scotland (“NES”) had notified you that they were unable to assist you on the basis you were not an NHS employee.</i></p> <p><b>Proved</b></p>
	<p>The Committee paid careful regard to the oral, written and documentary evidence presented to it in relation to this head of charge, and the other heads of charge that you face. It also took account of the submissions of Ms Woolfson on behalf of the GDC, and those made by you. The Committee identified the salient points of the evidence, and submissions, to be as follows.</p> <p><u>Transcript of the PCC hearing on 17 June 2022</u></p> <p>The Committee had regard to a copy of the transcript of the digital recording that was made of the PCC hearing held on 17 June 2022 by the company appointed by the Dental Professionals Hearings Service, namely Marten Walsh Cherer. The transcript records that you stated as follows:</p> <p><i>‘I have contacted NES on numerous occasions and been told eventually after several phone calls and I have emailed I was notified that because I didn’t work for the NHS Scotland and that I wasn’t an NHS Scotland contractor or under education they would be unable to help me with my PDP.’</i></p> <p><u>Oral and written evidence of Gillian Nevin</u></p> <p>The Committee also had regard to the witness statement of Gillian Nevin, who as stated above is an Assistant Postgraduate Dental Dean with (NES). Between 2019 and 2023 Ms Nevin and NES assisted you with the PDP and CPD aspects of the requirements of your conditional registration. Ms Nevin stated in her witness statement that she emailed the GDC on 8 July 2022 in relation to her concerns about the recent hearing determination, which the Committee understands relates to the determination arising out of the PCC hearing on 17 June 2022. Ms Nevin stated that she had attempted to contact you on a number of occasions in 2021 and 2022, and that you did not reply or that you missed calls that had been arranged. Ms Nevin reiterated that the offer of support remained open. Ms Nevin stated that, whilst the majority of NES’s support is given to NHS dentists, NES nonetheless does support dental care professionals, as well as, upon payment of an initial fee of £150.00, registrants who do not work in the NHS. In her oral evidence Ms Nevin clarified that at the start of contact with you in 2019 there had been a delay with the commencement of support for you, but that this fee was not pursued, and help was offered to you.</p> <p>Ms Nevin characterised your statement to the contrary, namely that NES had informed you that they could not help you as you were not an NHS employee, as incorrect and misleading, and that she was concerned by what you had said. Ms Nevin stated that the issues around support instead emanated from your lack of engagement. Ms Nevin stated that, if support was declined, it would be on account of a significant lack of engagement or a significant legal or ethical breach that could endanger her staff.</p> <p><u>Oral evidence of Christopher Clark</u></p> <p>Mr Clark sets out his involvement with your case as a GDC caseworker. In his oral evidence Mr Clark stated, on the basis of his recollection of other cases, that it is possible that you had been informed by NES that support had been declined</p>



for individuals who are not NHS employees, although he did not know whether any such refusal was on a conditional basis, such as payment of a fee.

Your written and oral evidence

Your case, in summary, is that you accept that you made the statement that you are alleged to have made, and that the information that you conveyed to the PCC had been provided to you during a telephone call that you had with an administrator at NES.

In your earlier response to the GDC at the Case Examiners stage of its proceedings you stated, *'I had been trying to contact the Dean at Dundee (Gillian Niven) [sic] and they have been trying to contact myself but after a while it was discovered as for [sic] as I know they were used no the wrong email [sic], once this was rectified I had regular meeting [sic] with the Dean regarding my PDP [...] I would also like to state that I did contact Dundee Deanery and spoke to someone in the department who told me that they would not be able to help as I was not an NHS Employee[.] I did not make this up but passed the information onto the GDC caseworker [...] I believe the whole thing was a complete misunderstanding [sic].*

The Committee had particular regard to the email correspondence that you had with Ms Nevin in relation to obtaining NES support. One such email exchange took place on 25 September and 1 October 2019. On 25 September 2019 in her email to you Ms Nevin described the support that was available to you and referred to the £150.00 fee payable by a non-NHS dentist referred to above. On 1 October 2019 you replied to that email, and stated that you had arranged for an invoice to be sent to you. In your oral evidence, which is referred to more directly below, you produced a copy of the invoice that you had received dated 30 September 2019 for the purposes of receiving mentoring support. Your oral evidence to the Committee is that you think that you paid the invoice when you were chased for payment in or around March 2021.

In your oral evidence to the Committee you stated that you did not try to deliberately mislead the GDC, but that you accept that what you said to the PCC *'was not 100 per cent true'*. You accepted that the transcript of the PCC resumed hearing on 17 June 2022 is an accurate record of the proceedings. You stated that you were originally in contact with Ms Nevin of NES in 2019. You stated that at no time did you decline NES assistance. You stated that you recall a meeting was arranged in Dundee in or around March 2020, shortly prior to the onset of the COVID-19 lockdown, and that you were unable to attend due to a personal health matter. You stated that travel restrictions relating to the COVID-19 pandemic then prohibited you from attending appointments with Ms Nevin, and that you had sought guidance from the police in relation to those restrictions.

You stated that, as Ms Nevin was difficult to contact by telephone, and as her email address had changed in or around December 2020, you subsequently spoke to an administrator using the contact telephone number for the Dundee Deanery whose name you do not know, and that, having explained your situation but not having given your name, you were informed that NES could not help you at that time given that you were not an NHS employee or undertaking NHS work. You stated that you passed on that information to the GDC, who gave you Ms Nevin's new contact details, which you stated did not have until that time, as her email address had changed as referred to above. You stated that you contacted Ms Nevin at around the time of the PCC review hearing on 17 June 2022. You stated that regular meetings with Ms Nevin then followed. You submitted that some meetings were cancelled for reasons relating to your health.



You characterised the matter has a ‘miscommunication’ and a ‘misunderstanding’ between you, Ms Nevin and the GDC, and you maintained that you were informed by NES in or around late March 2022 that NES could not help you as you were not an NHS employee.

You stated in your oral evidence to the Committee that in or around March 2022 you did not have a specific email address for Ms Nevin, and that, prior to March 2022, you had instead used a generic NES email address. You stated that you had previously been in contact with Ms Nevin, including in September 2020, but that subsequent emails you had sent to her every couple of months or so had not been replied to. You were asked to produce copies of emails that you sent in the period after 3 September 2020 and before March 2022, and you provided one email, namely dated 24 February 2022, which you stated you sent to Ms Nevin at the existing email address that you had for her. You accepted that you are not able to produce any other emails to NES or Gillian Nevin in that period, and accepted in cross-examination that there were none. You did however state that you attempted to telephone NES on a number of occasions.

You stated that in March 2022 you emailed Christopher Clark at the GDC and asked for an email address and telephone number for Ms Nevin. You stated that, in around late March 2022, you then telephoned the telephone number that Mr Clark gave to you, and spoke with an administrator at Dundee Deanery. You stated that the administrator had informed you that they could not help you as you were not an NHS employee. You stated that, however, you were subsequently able to contact Ms Nevin directly in or around June 2022, and that you were then assisted by her.

In your oral evidence you were taken to a copy of a report dated 1 June 2022 written by your reporter pursuant to the conditions to which your registration was subject. You stated that your reporter was mistaken when he recorded in his report that you were only told at the end of May [2022] that deanery assistance was not available to you as you were not an NHS employee, and that instead, as referred to above, you were so informed in late March 2022.

You were taken to the findings of dishonest conduct made by the PCC in November 2016 as summarised above. You stated that you accept that you have previously been dishonest in the course of your practice. You stated that you have not been dishonest to this Committee, and that you were also not dishonest to the PCC when you appeared before it on 17 June 2022.

#### GDC submissions on the facts

Ms Woolfson submitted that the evidence presented to the Committee is sufficient for the Committee to find that you provided false information to the PCC as alleged. Ms Woolfson submitted that your evidence to this Committee is not reliable or credible, and that the Committee should reject your evidence that the purported conversation with NES in or around late March 2022 did in fact occur.

#### Your submissions

Your case is that you did, in fact, speak to someone at NES in or around late March 2022 and were informed that NES could not help you as you were not an NHS employee. You stated that you recognise that you previously acted dishonestly as determined by the PCC in November 2016. You stated that you have given an honest account of what was indeed said to you by NES in late March 2022 during a telephone conversation that you had with them. You stated



that the only people who are able to attest to that conversation are you and the administrator with whom you state you spoke. You submitted that the conversation did indeed take place, and that Ms Nevin cannot possibly state that the conversation did not take place, as it is beyond her knowledge.

#### Committee's decision

The Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 1 (a) proved.

The Committee notes that you accept that you made the statement in question to the PCC, and that this fact is further proved by the transcript of those proceedings. The Committee then went on to determine whether this information was false.

The Committee had particular regard to the email correspondence that you had with Ms Nevin in relation to obtaining NES support. One such email exchange took place on 25 September and 1 October 2019. On 25 September 2019 in her email to you Ms Nevin described the support that was available to you and referred to the £150.00 fee payable by a non-NHS dentist referred to above. On 1 October 2019 you replied to that email, and stated that you had arranged for an invoice to be sent to you. In your oral evidence, which is referred to more directly below, you produced a copy of the invoice that you had received dated 30 September 2019 for the purposes of receiving mentoring support. Your oral evidence to the Committee is that you think that you paid the invoice when you were chased for payment in or around March 2021. In the Committee's judgement this demonstrates that you knew that NES support was available to you, albeit at a cost, as a non-NHS employee.

The Committee also accepts the evidence of Ms Nevin as summarised above, namely that the information that you provided to the PCC was false, as support was, in fact, available to you as a non-NHS employee. The Committee considers that this information is clear, credible and consistent. The evidence is that NES consistently made known to you that support was available to you.

The Committee does not accept your account of you having a conversation with NES to the effect that NES could not help you as you were not an NHS employee. The Committee understands from your evidence that you did not inform the person with whom you apparently spoke who you were, and what the background to your contact with NES was. The Committee considers that it is more likely than not that this conversation as you described did not take place. On your evidence you had already received an invoice and apparently made payment by that time, and the Committee considers that, had you in fact been told by NES in late March 2022 that they could not help you, in the Committee's judgement it is inherently unlikely that you would have accepted this information at face value without further enquiry before you relayed it to the PCC on 17 June 2022. The Committee also considers it more likely than not that you would have drawn to NES's and the GDC's attention the existing arrangements, namely that you had already been invoiced, and had made payment for, NES support. This may well have included you seeking a refund of the sum that you had already paid to NES for the provision of support.

The Committee also considers that your evidence lacks further credibility on account of you not being able to state with whom you spoke and the date of the conversation. The Committee considers that, given the importance of what you state you were told by NES, it is more likely than not that you would have made a note of the conversation had it in fact taken place in the manner that you say it did. The Committee also notes that there is no documentary record, whether

	<p>contemporaneous or otherwise, to support your evidence of a conversation of the sort described by you having taken place. The Committee found that it was not able to rely on your account of the circumstances surrounding these matters, for instance in light of inconsistencies and contradictions regarding the reasons for your non-attendance at NES meetings and your contact with NES.</p> <p>In deciding that you were not, in fact, informed by NES that support was not available to you, the Committee also had regard to the evidence presented to it of your previous dishonest conduct as found as a matter of fact by the PCC in November 2016. This previous finding does not mean that you are bound to provide false information, but the Committee considers that this previous finding connotes a pattern of behaviour.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 1 (a) proved.</p>
2.	<i>Your conduct in relation to 1a above was:</i>
2. (a)	<p><i>Misleading</i></p> <p><b>Proved</b></p>
	<p>The Committee considers that your proven conduct at head of charge 1 (a) was misleading.</p> <p>The Committee considers that the false information that you provided to the PCC at its resumed hearing on 17 June 2022 misled that Committee into believing that you had been refused NES support on the basis that you were not an NHS employee when that was not, in fact, the case. The Committee notes that that PCC was persuaded that you had not breached a condition on your registration requiring you to work with the Deanery, which in your case was NES, in satisfaction of your conditions. The false information provided to that PCC in June 2022 had the effect of depriving that Committee of a proper understanding of the issue. This Committee notes that the reviewing PCC on 17 June 2022 was, as a matter of fact, misled, as it determined to remove conditions requiring your co-operation with the Deanery.</p> <p>The Committee therefore finds the facts alleged at head of charge 2 (a) proved.</p>
2. (b)	<p><i>Dishonest</i></p> <p><b>Proved</b></p>
	<p>In approaching this head of charge the Committee applied the test set out in <i>Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd. t/a Crockfords</i> [2017] UKSC 67. The test is that the Committee must decide subjectively the actual state of your knowledge or belief as to the facts, and must then apply the objective standards of ordinary and decent people to determine whether your conduct is dishonest by those standards.</p> <p>The GDC submits that your conduct was dishonest on the basis that you knew that what you said was false. Ms Woolfson submitted that the evidence adduced by the GDC demonstrates that you knew that NES support was, in fact, available to you when you made representations to the contrary to the PCC on 17 June</p>

2022. You state that you did not act dishonestly, as you were informed by NES to the contrary.

The Committee first considered the actual state of your knowledge and belief as to the facts. The Committee found above, that, based in particular on the email exchanges that you had with Ms Nevin in relation to obtaining NES support on 25 September and 1 October 2019, you knew that NES support was available to you, albeit at a cost, as a non-NHS employee. The Committee has also found that it is more likely than not that the purported conversation with NES in or around late March 2022 did not take place in the manner that you suggest. The Committee finds that your knowledge and belief as to the facts was that NES support was available to you, and that you acted dishonestly in saying the opposite to the PCC on 17 June 2022. The Committee considers that you misdirected the PCC in a deliberately deceitful manner in order to frustrate its proper consideration of your case, and particularly in order to avoid the sanction of suspension sought by the GDC at that hearing arising from your lack of contact with NES and its consequences for your compliance with the conditions to which your registration was subject. In reaching this finding the Committee has also again had regard to the previous finding of dishonest conduct made by the PCC in November 2016, and this Committee considers that there is evidence of a pattern of obfuscatory behaviour.

The Committee also considers that your conduct would be considered to be dishonest by reference to the standards of ordinary and decent people. The Committee considers that your conduct would be seen as a deliberate attempt to subvert the proper functioning of the PCC to your own interests in circumstances where you had not co-operated with NES despite their support being available to you.

The Committee therefore finds the facts alleged at head of charge 2 (b) proved.

15. We move to stage two.

### **Determination on adjournment - 6 August 2025**

16. Following the handing down of the Committee's findings of fact on 6 August 2025, the Committee invited representations at around 1510 hours on that same day as to whether to adjourn the hearing in accordance with Rule 58 of the Rules.

17. Ms Woolfson invited the Committee to adjourn given the lack of available time in which to conclude this case. You agreed with Ms Woolfson's submissions, and added that it would provide you with time to prepare for the second stage of the hearing.

18. The Committee, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, and having regard to the requirements and provisions of Rule 58, determined that the appropriate, and indeed only, possible course of action is to adjourn the hearing part-heard due to the lack of available time in which to continue and conclude the case.

19. The Committee understands that the dates of 13 and 14 October 2025 have been identified for the continuation and conclusion of the hearing. The Committee requests and directs that parties afford every assistance to the Dental Professionals Hearings Service, and to each other, in advance of those dates so that the hearing can continue in as expeditious a manner as possible.

20. We are now adjourned part-heard.

## **Determination on misconduct, impairment and sanction – 14 October 2025**

21. The hearing resumed on 13 October 2025 following the adjournment on 6 August 2025.

### **Further evidence**

22. At the outset of the resumed hearing on 13 October 2025, and before the commencement of the second stage, you produced an email that you received at 0644 hours on that morning. The email purported to come from your then workplace supervisor in relation to the telephone conversation that you claimed you had with NES. The email in fact came from a company email address that you told the Committee was the former company of your then workplace supervisor. When questioned you stated that the company was no longer trading. You stated that your then workplace supervisor was not able to attend the hearing to give evidence. The email claimed that, in around the spring of 2021, your workplace supervisor was present when you made a telephone call to NES that has given rise to these proceedings. The email stated that you were informed that NES was unable to help you. You asked the Committee to take the email into consideration in relation to its earlier finding that you had acted dishonestly in respect of the telephone conversation. You invited the Committee to consider that the email demonstrates that the conversation was as you have previously described it, and that you were informed that NES could not assist you.

23. Ms Woolfson opposed any reopening of the factual inquiry, and submitted that there does not appear to be any statutory provision for the Committee to do so. Ms Woolfson cited the case of *General Medical Council v Nduka* [2017] EWHC 1396 (Admin) in this regard. Ms Woolfson however did not oppose the Committee taking into account the aspects of the email which consist of a character testimonial reference.

24. The Legal Adviser advised the Committee that the Committee has no power to reopen its factual inquiry. You and Ms Woolfson accepted that advice. The Committee, having retired *into camera*, decided to accept the advice of the Legal Adviser that it does not have the power to reopen its factual inquiry. The Committee was however content to have regard to the character testimonial aspects of the email.

### **Observations on the Committee's findings of fact**

25. Prior to the commencement of stage two, Ms Woolfson invited the Committee to amend its foregoing determination on the facts by altering the wording at certain points. The Committee made changes to correct typographical and grammatical errors only. The determination was duly amended and recirculated.

### **Proceedings at stage two**

26. The Committee has considered all the evidence presented to it, both oral and documentary. It has taken into account the submissions made by Ms Woolfson on behalf of the GDC and those made by you. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

### **Evidence at stage two**

27. Save for the email from your then workplace supervisor as referred to above, the Committee received no further oral or documentary evidence at this stage of the hearing.

### **Summary of submissions**

28. Ms Woolfson on behalf of the GDC invited the Committee to determine that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on public interest grounds. Ms Woolfson invited the Committee to direct that your name be suspended from the register for a period of between three and six months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. Ms Woolfson invited the Committee to impose such a suspension against both titles with which you are registered with the GDC, namely those of clinical dental technician and dental technician.
29. In your submissions you stated that you recognise that you have in the past said things which are 'not 100 per cent true', and which could be construed as misleading. You stated that you did not act in a dishonest manner or a deliberately dishonest manner, and you maintained that you were indeed informed by NES that they could not assist you as you were not an NHS employee. You stated that you recognise that you are not able to prove that the telephone conversation did take place in the manner that you maintain it was. You stated that you however admit that you have made 'mistakes' in your dealings with the GDC. You stated that you recognise that a finding of dishonesty reflects badly on the profession. You stated that you do not consider that your fitness to practise is currently impaired, and you submitted that you do not pose a risk to patients or the public. You referred to the devastating consequences that any period of suspension would have for you, and on fellow registrants and patients.

#### **Fitness to practise history**

30. Ms Woolfson addressed the Committee in accordance with Rule 20 (1) (a) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules').
31. As set out in the Committee's earlier determination, the PCC held a hearing of inquiry in November 2016. At that hearing the PCC determined that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct. The facts which gave rise to the finding of misconduct included findings of dishonest conduct relating to your record-keeping, and in relation to your contact with, and about, a patient. The PCC determined to suspend your registration for a period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. The suspension was reviewed by the PCC on 6 December 2017 and was extended by 12 months. At the review hearing that took place on 28 November 2018 the PCC decided to replace the direction of suspended registration with one of conditional registration for a period of 12 months, again with a review.
32. The direction of conditional registration was subsequently reviewed and extended by the PCC at resumed hearings held on 27 November 2019 and 2 December 2020. The conditions were then extended on a further occasion by the PCC on 10 December 2021, with variations made to the conditions. The variations related to a requirement that you meet with the Postgraduate Dental Dean or Director, or a nominated deputy, to develop your personal development plan (PDP). At the resumed hearing of the PCC on 17 June 2022 the PCC reviewed and varied the conditions to which your registration was subject. The representations that you made at that review hearing have given rise to the current proceedings.
33. The varied conditions were next reviewed by the PCC on 23 August 2022 and were once more varied. On 29 November 2022 the conditions were reviewed once more by the PCC. The PCC determined that your fitness to practise as a dental technician was no longer impaired, but determined that your fitness to practise as a clinical dental technician remained impaired. The conditions in place against your name under the title of clinical dental technician were varied. The conditions as varied were next reviewed by the PCC on 12 June 2023 and were extended. The conditions were next reviewed by the PCC on 22 February 2024. The PCC, having determined that your fitness to practise was no longer impaired, decided to allow the conditions to lapse.

## Misconduct

34. The Committee first considered whether the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 1 (a), 2 (a) and 2 (b) constitute misconduct. In considering this and all other matters, the Committee has exercised its own independent judgement.
35. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the following paragraphs of the GDC's *Standards for the Dental Team* (September 2013) in place at the time of the incidents giving rise to the facts that the Committee has found proved. These paragraphs state that as a dental care professional:
- 1.3 *You must be honest and act with integrity.*
- 1.3.1 *You must justify the trust that patients, the public and your colleagues place in you by always acting honestly and fairly in your dealings with them. This applies to any business or education activities in which you are involved as well as to your professional dealings.*
- 1.3.2 *You must make sure you do not bring the profession into disrepute.*
- 9.4 *You must co-operate with any relevant formal or informal inquiry and give full and truthful information.*
36. The Committee's findings of fact relate to the representations that you made to the PCC when you appeared before it on 17 June 2022 in connection with separate fitness to practise proceedings. The Committee found that you provided false information to the PCC, in that you stated that NES had notified you that they were unable to assist you because you were not an NHS employee. The Committee went on to determine that your conduct was misleading, and was also dishonest, in that you knew that NES support was in fact available to you despite you not being an NHS employee.
37. In light of the findings of fact that it has made, the Committee has determined that the proven facts amount to misconduct. The Committee considers that your conduct was a serious falling short of the standards reasonably to be expected of a registered dental professional, and was a breach of a fundamental tenet of the profession, namely the need to be honest and act with integrity. The Committee considers that fellow dental professionals would consider your conduct to be deplorable.
38. The Committee has therefore determined that the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 1 (a), 2 (a) and 2 (b) amount to misconduct.

## Impairment

39. The Committee next considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found. In doing so, the Committee again exercised its own independent judgement.
40. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has borne in mind that its overarching objective is to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
41. The Committee first considered whether your misconduct has been remedied. The Committee recognises that the misconduct that it has found, relating as it does to your dishonest conduct, might be more difficult to remedy than, say, discrete clinical issues. The Committee considers that in reality you have provided little, if anything, in the way of evidence to demonstrate that you have developed meaningful insight into your misconduct, or that you

have taken any steps to remedy your dishonest conduct. You suggested in your oral address to the Committee that you have reflected on this Committee's findings, as well the findings of previous Committees, but you provided little detail in support of your contention. Indeed, your oral submissions suggest that you do not appear to fully understand and accept this Committee's finding of dishonest conduct. At this late stage your submissions are largely characterised by you maintaining that you were informed by NES that assistance was not available to you, and that you did not act dishonestly. The Committee found your submissions to be self-serving, contradictory and made without proper acknowledgement of its findings of fact. You have similarly provided little in the way of evidence that you truly understand the impact that your dishonest conduct has on the profession and on the public's trust and confidence in it. In the Committee's judgement these considerations are important facets of public protection.

42. The Committee considers that your dishonest conduct is highly damaging to your fitness to practise. The Committee considers that the need to act honestly and with integrity is intrinsic to safe practice and professional responsibilities, and that a failure to act in such a manner is liable to put the public at unwarranted risk of harm. The Committee's finding of dishonesty was set out in the following terms in the Committee's foregoing determination on the facts:

*'The Committee considers that you misdirected the PCC in a deliberately deceitful manner in order to frustrate its proper consideration of your case, and particularly in order to avoid the sanction of suspension sought by the GDC at that hearing arising from your lack of contact with NES and its consequences for your compliance with the conditions to which your registration was subject.'*

43. The GDC's overarching objective is to protect the public. In order for it to be able to do so registrants need to co-operate with the GDC and provide full and accurate information. The dishonest representations that you made to the PCC deprived it of a proper understanding of the prevailing circumstances when it was deciding how best to manage the restrictions in place on your registration. These restrictions were intended to protect the public. In this Committee's judgement your dishonest representations had the effect of frustrating the proper functioning of the GDC's regulatory mechanisms. You subverted the regulatory process in pursuit of your own interests, namely a more favourable outcome for you. The Committee considers that you are liable to act dishonestly in the future because of your lack of insight and remediation, and in its judgement this would place the public at unwarranted risk of harm, as well as further undermining public trust and confidence in the profession. The shortcomings in your insight into, and remediation of, your dishonest conduct mean that you pose a risk to the public. The Committee therefore finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired.
44. The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is further required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. Your dishonest conduct has brought the profession into considerable disrepute. In the Committee's judgement the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the serious nature of your misconduct.
45. Accordingly, the Committee finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct.

### **Sanction**

46. The Committee then determined what sanction, if any, is appropriate in light of the findings of facts, misconduct and impairment that it has made. The Committee recognises that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have such an effect, but is instead imposed to protect patients and safeguard the wider public interests mentioned above.

47. In reaching its decision the Committee has again taken into account the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests. The Committee has once more exercised its own independent judgement.
48. The Committee has paid careful regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors present in this case.
49. In respect of the mitigating factors that are present, the Committee notes that, whilst some time has passed since the incident giving rise to these proceedings, you do not appear to have accepted the Committee's findings about what happened. The Committee was therefore not able to attach any weight to this potentially mitigating factor. Similarly, although you expressed some, albeit limited, remorse for what has happened, you appeared to be unable to explain why, and for what, you were apologising. The Committee was therefore again not able to attach any real weight to this consideration. Whilst the Committee noted the testimonial email referred to above, it found that it could not attach any weight to it, because it found that it had doubts as to its veracity. In particular, the Committee, mindful that it and a previous Committee have made findings of dishonesty against you arising out of your self-serving conduct, considered that it was not able to conclude that the email was genuine.
50. In terms of aggravating factors, the Committee is again mindful that its findings relate to dishonest conduct, that you lack insight into that dishonest conduct, that your actions amount to a blatant and wilful disregard of the role of the GDC, that you appear to have deceived the PCC in order to continue to work, and that you have fitness to practise history with the GDC, including a previous finding of dishonest conduct.
51. The Committee has considered the range of sanctions available to it, starting with the least restrictive. In the light of its findings, the Committee considers that taking no action, or issuing a reprimand, would not be sufficient in the particular circumstances of this case. In the Committee's judgement the public would be placed at unwarranted risk of harm if no action were taken or if a reprimand were issued. Further, public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would also be significantly undermined if no action were taken or if a reprimand were issued.
52. The Committee next considered whether a period of conditional registration would be appropriate. The Committee found that conditions would be insufficient to protect the public and address the public interest considerations engaged in this case as referred to above. The Committee found that conditions cannot be formulated given that the findings in this case relate to dishonest conduct, and in particular dishonest representations made in connection with conditions.
53. The Committee next considered whether a period of suspended registration would represent a suitable disposal of this case. After careful consideration, the Committee has found that a direction of suspended registration would not be sufficient to meet the risks to the public and the wider public interest. Your misconduct represents a serious departure from the professional standards expected of a registered dental care professional. You have breached a fundamental tenet of the profession, namely the need to act with honesty and integrity. You have displayed a persistent lack of insight into your misconduct. The misconduct that the Committee has found is suggestive of a deep-seated and harmful professional attitudinal issue, particularly as you have already been the subject of a finding of dishonesty in connection with separate fitness to practise proceedings. In the Committee's judgement your dishonesty and blatant disregard for the regulatory process appears to be ingrained and entrenched. The Committee considers that a direction of suspended registration would not be sufficient to protect the public and safeguard the wider public interest considerations which are so intimately engaged, and damaged, in the especially serious circumstances of this case. In the Committee's judgement your dishonest conduct and persistent lack of insight

into and remediation of your dishonesty is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration.

54. Accordingly, the Committee directs that your name be erased from the register. The Committee has determined that this sanction will apply to both of your registered titles, namely clinical dental technician and dental technician.
55. The Committee is aware that this decision may have serious consequences for you. However, the Committee considers that its overarching duty to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour, outweighs your own interests in the particular circumstances of this case.
56. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether your registration should be made subject to an immediate order of suspension pending the substantive direction of erasure taking effect.

#### **Determination on immediate order – 14 October 2025**

57. The Committee has again had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.
58. Ms Woolfson on behalf of the GDC submitted that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest.
59. You opposed the making of an immediate order so that you might be afforded time to make appropriate arrangements at your place of work in anticipation of your name being erased from the register. You submitted that an immediate order of suspension would preclude you from doing so, and that as such colleagues and the public would be unnecessarily inconvenienced.
60. In all the circumstances, the Committee considers that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The Committee has determined that, given the risks to the public and the public interest that it has identified, it would not be appropriate to permit you to practise before the substantive direction of erasure takes effect. The Committee considers that an immediate order for suspension is consistent with the findings that it has set out in its foregoing determination. The Committee has determined that this sanction will apply to both of your registered titles, namely clinical dental technician and dental technician.
61. The effect of the foregoing determination and this immediate order is that your registration will be suspended from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served upon you. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive direction of erasure will be recorded in the register 28 days from the date of deemed service. Should you decide to exercise your right of appeal, this immediate order of suspension will remain in place until the resolution of any such appeal.
62. That concludes this case.