

Part-held in Private

**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing**

26 February 2025

Name: WOODFINE, Abbie

Registration number: 253563

Case number: CAS-203429-Y1W3F2

General Dental Council: Sharmistha Michaels, counsel
Instructed by Amy Jones of IHLPS

Registrant: Not present
Not represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of (i) conviction; (ii) misconduct. Not impaired by reason of adverse physical or mental health

Outcome: Erasure

Immediate order: Immediate order of suspension

Committee members: Michael Speakman (Chair, Dentist member)
Valerie Atkinson (Lay member)
Lynne Frewin (DCP member)

Legal adviser: Jenny Appleton

Committee Secretary: Paul Carson

CHARGE

WOODFINE, Abbie, a dental nurse, Diploma in Dental Nursing Level 3 QCF City & Guilds 2014 was summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 25 February 2025 for an inquiry into the following charge:

The Charge

The hearing will be held to consider the following charge against you:

“That being registered as a dental care professional:

1. On 16 February 2023, you were convicted at Newton Aycliffe Magistrates Court, for driving a motor vehicle on 21 January 2023 after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 99 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit, Contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.
2. On 16 February 2023, you were convicted at Newton Aycliffe Magistrates Court, for failing to stop after an accident on 21 January 2023, Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.
3. You failed to immediately inform the General Dental Council that you were charged with failing to stop after an accident on 21 January 2023, Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.
4. You failed to cooperate with an investigation conducted by the GDC by not providing the GDC with any or insufficient evidence of indemnity and/or employment information.
5. Your actions in relation to 3 and/or 4 above were:
 - a. Misleading, and/or
 - b. Dishonest.
6. You have an adverse mental or physical health condition as set out in Schedule A^{1*}.

And that, by reasons of the facts alleged your fitness to practice is impaired by reasons of conviction and/or misconduct and/or adverse physical or mental health.”

¹ Schedule A is a private document that cannot be disclosed.

At this hearing the Committee made a determination that includes some private information. That information shall be omitted from the public version of this determination and that document marked to show where private material has been removed.

1. The allegations against Miss Woodfine, a dental nurse, relate to two convictions which she received on 16 February 2023 and her failure to have informed the General Dental Council (GDC) of the full extent of the criminal proceedings to which she was subject. She is also alleged to have failed to have cooperated with the GDC's ensuing investigation into her fitness to practise. There were also concerns arising in respect of her health. Part of the hearing was held in private under Rule 54 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the "Rules") in so far as reference was made to her actual or alleged health.

Service and absence

2. Miss Woodfine was neither present nor represented at this hearing, which was conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams. Ms Michaels, on behalf of the GDC, submitted that notice of this hearing had been duly served in accordance with the Rules and that the Committee should proceed in her absence.
3. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on service and proceeding in absence.
4. The notification of hearing was sent to Miss Woodstone at her registered address on 22 January 2025 by both first-class post and Special Delivery. A link to download a copy of the notification of hearing was also sent to her by email on the same day. Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' records that the Special Delivery item was delivered on 24 January 2025, signed for under the name "WOODFINE". The Committee was satisfied that the notification contained the required information under Rule 13 of the Rules, including the time, date and (remote) venue of this hearing; and that it had been served on her in accordance with the requirements of Rule 65 by virtue of its being posted to her registered address.
5. Having satisfied itself of effective service, the next consideration for the Committee was whether to proceed with the hearing in Miss Woodfine's absence. This is a discretion which must be exercised with great care and caution. The Committee was satisfied that the GDC had made all reasonable efforts to send notice of this hearing to her. On 23 January 2025, it emailed her to state "*Today is the deadline for you to provide any written disclosure documents for the PCC hearing. Can you confirm whether you wish to submit anything in relation to this matter?*". She replied the same day to state:

"I don't get why this keeps being reviewed as I am no longer dental nursing, please stop contacting me. I have repeatedly asked to be taken of the register it happened over 2 year ago so please just stop contacting me and wasting your time."

6. The GDC responded the following day to explain to Miss Woodfine the option to apply for voluntary removal and to ask her whether she wished to be sent the relevant forms, in response to which she stated: "Yes please".
7. There was no record before the Committee of any further communication from Miss Woodfine regarding this hearing. There was no application from her for an adjournment and there was nothing to suggest to the Committee that postponing the hearing would make her attendance any more likely at a future date. Having regard to all the circumstances, the Committee determined that she had voluntarily absented herself from this hearing and that it would be fair and in the public interest to proceed notwithstanding her absence.

Evidence

8. The Committee heard oral evidence from Mr M. Ali, a caseworker at the GDC. He provided the Committee with a production statement dated 2 September 2024 setting out the GDC's records of communications and correspondence with Miss Woodfine.
9. [IN PRIVATE]
10. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on the factual inquiry.
11. The burden is on the GDC to prove each allegation on the balance of probabilities.

Findings

12. On 16 February 2023, Miss Woodfine was convicted on her guilty plea of: (i) driving a motor vehicle on 21 January 2023 whilst over the prescribed limit of alcohol; and (ii) failing to stop after an accident, contrary to sections 5(1)(a) and 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988. A Police Report of the incident states that she said she had consumed "4 medium glasses of wine" before driving herself home that evening. According to the Police Report she collided with another vehicle, "causing minor damage to the vehicle and causing no injury, she briefly stopped before being asked to pull over properly by ambulance staff who happened to be on scene, she failed to do so and drove off, continuing her journey home."
13. The Police traced Miss Woodfine to her home address using licence plate details which had been recorded by a witness. At her home address the Police found her to be "heavily intoxicated". She was arrested for drink driving and failing to stop following a road traffic

collision. Whilst being arrested she stated that *“she had been at the home address all night and firstly that her partner been driving the vehicle then it was her friend that was responsible.”* She later admitted in custody that she had been driving. The level of alcohol in her breath was measured to be some three times the prescribed limit. When interviewed under caution, she *“initially stated that she had consumed half the amount of alcohol in a pub prior to driving and consumed more at home following the collision however following a challenging second interview she admitted that she had consumed more prior to driving and confirmed she had not consumed any alcohol once returning home. States she had lied in order to get a lesser punishment.”*

14. Upon being convicted on 16 February 2023, Miss Woodfine emailed the GDC with the subject line “URGENT” to state:

“Hi my name is Abbie Woodfine my GDC number is 253563, I have currently rang the GDC to report a drink driving offence I have committed. I currently work at [...] dental practice [...] they are aware of the situation & asked me to contact in regards to been struck off, as this shows as DR10 on a CRB check so would fail. If you could reply as soon as possible that would be great.”

15. The GDC wrote to Miss Woodfine at 08:08 on 17 February 2023 to request further information. At 08:42 she responded, stating:

“Yeah I have been charged with drink driving the incident occurred on 21st January 2023. They have imposed a ban from now till I go back to Aycliffe magistrates on the 15th March 2023 to find out long for as it was adjourned yesterday, as stated before in a DBS I have never been in trouble with the law before and it’s first offence. Nobody was hurt or in the car but me, my employer is aware as work 30 minutes away from home & need my license to get to work. I am only checking and informing as i don’t wanna mess with employer’s around, thanks Abbie.”

16. At 09:00 the GDC replied to state:

“Thank you for providing the additional information.

Please can you provide any documentation provided to you by the police.

Please can you confirm if known, how much over the drink driving limit were you.”

17. Miss Woodfine responded at 09:01, stating:

“I got rid off [sic] the charge sheet as was told didn’t need it anymore all paperwork will be at court now so won’t receive any till 15th March 2023. I was 99 so three times over but [IN PRIVATE] so my solicitor is contesting that.”

18. No further communications passed between Miss Woodfine and the GDC until 7 March 2023, when the GDC emailed her a link to download a letter of the same date. The letter requested information from her to “*help us in the early stages of considering a concern we have received about your drink driving charge that you told us on 16 February 2023.*” The requested information included, among other things, details of her work history and proof of her indemnity arrangements “*from 01 February 2023 to date*”. The letter required her to provide this information by 21 March 2023.
19. Miss Woodfine replied on the same day to explain that she could not access the file. The GDC therefore arranged for the correspondence to be posted to her home address. There followed a series of exchanges between the GDC and Miss Woodfine in which the GDC repeatedly requested from her the information in question and gave her extended deadlines within which to provide it.
20. Notwithstanding these repeated requests, Miss Woodfine did not provide the requested information. She instead submitted [IN PRIVATE]
21. [IN PRIVATE]
22. The GDC spoke with Miss Woodfine over the telephone later on 30 March 2023, reiterating to her the need to provide the requested employment and indemnity information. On 13 April 2023, it wrote to her by email to state:
- “Further to our email and telephone call with you on 30 March 2023, we have still not received the information we requested.*
- We are now giving you a final deadline of **20 April 2023** to send us the required documentation.”*
23. Miss Woodfine did not provide the requested information, either by the further extended deadline of 20 April 2023 or at all. To date, the GDC remains unaware of her relevant work history and indemnity status.
24. As part of its investigation into Miss Woodfine’s fitness to practise, the GDC obtained a Police National Computer printout and Certified Memorandum of Conviction from Newton Aycliffe Magistrates’ Court dated 19 June 2024 showing the two convictions. It was only upon the reviewing these documents that the GDC discovered that she had also been convicted of failing to stop after an accident in addition to her declared conviction of driving a motor vehicle on 21 January 2023 whilst over the prescribed limit of alcohol.
25. I will now announce the Committee’s findings in relation to each head of charge:



1.	<p><i>On 16 February 2023, you were convicted at Newton Aycliffe Magistrates Court, for driving a motor vehicle on 21 January 2023 after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 99 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit, Contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>In accordance with Rule 57(5) of the Rules, the Committee accepted the certified Memorandum of Conviction as conclusive proof of the conviction. The Memorandum records that she was fined £384 and disqualified from driving for 25 months with a disqualification reduction period of 25 weeks upon completion of a course.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved.</p>
2.	<p><i>On 16 February 2023, you were convicted at Newton Aycliffe Magistrates Court, for failing to stop after an accident on 21 January 2023, Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>In accordance with Rule 57(5) of the Rules, the Committee accepted the certified Memorandum of Conviction as conclusive proof of the conviction. The Memorandum records that no additional sentence was imposed for this offence.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved.</p>
3.	<p><i>You failed to immediately inform the General Dental Council that you were charged with failing to stop after an accident on 21 January 2023, Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>Standard 9.3.1 of the GDC's <i>Standards for the Dental Team</i> (September 2013) states: "You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world. See our guidance on reporting criminal proceedings for more information." The referenced</p>



	<p>guidance on reporting criminal proceedings identifies both being charged and being convicted as matters about which dental professionals must immediately inform the GDC.</p> <p>The Committee was therefore satisfied that Miss Woodfine was under a clear professional duty to have immediately informed the GDC upon being charged with failing to stop after an accident. She did not do so at that stage. Neither did she do so upon being convicted or in any of her subsequent communications with the GDC. She first informed the GDC on 16 February 2023 of her conviction for drink driving but did not inform it at any stage that she had also been convicted on the same date of failing to stop after an accident. The GDC only discovered this second conviction when it obtained the Police National Computer report and the Memorandum of Conviction.</p> <p>The Committee was therefore satisfied that Miss Woodfine had failed to immediately inform the GDC of being charged (and later convicted) over this additional matter in accordance with her professional duty.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved.</p>
4.	<p><i>You failed to cooperate with an investigation conducted by the GDC by not providing the GDC with any or insufficient evidence of indemnity and/or employment information.</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>Standard 9.4 of the GDC's <i>Standards for the Dental Team</i> (September 2013) states: "<i>You must co-operate with any relevant formal or informal inquiry and give full and truthful information</i>". And standard 9.4.1 states: "<i>If you receive a letter from the GDC in connection with concerns about your fitness to practise, you must respond fully within the time specified in the letter. You should also seek advice from your indemnity provider or professional association.</i>"</p> <p>The Committee was therefore satisfied that Miss Woodfine was under a professional duty to respond to the GDC's requests for information as part of its investigation. As already set out, the GDC repeatedly requested employment and indemnity information from her and gave her extended deadlines by which to provide this information, but she is still yet to comply with those requests.</p>



	<p>The Committee therefore determined that she had failed to cooperate with the GDC's investigation.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved.</p>
5.	<p><i>Your actions in relation to 3 and/or 4 above were:</i></p>
5.(a)	<p><i>Misleading, and/or</i></p> <p>Found proved in respect of charge 3. Found not proved in respect of charge 4.</p> <p>Misleading for the purposes of this charge refers to the objective effect of the conduct, regardless of Miss Woodfine's intention.</p> <p>In respect of charge 3, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Woodfine's failure to have immediately informed the GDC of the criminal proceedings was misleading. By not informing it that she had been charged with failing to stop after an accident, she caused it to be misled into assuming that she had only been convicted of the drink driving offence.</p> <p>In respect of charge 4, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Woodfine's repeated failure to provide the requested information was conduct that obstructed the GDC investigation and prevented it from identifying her work history and indemnity status. However, the Committee could not find that this was misleading, in that there was no active misdirection.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved in respect of charge 3 but not charge 4.</p>
5.(b)	<p><i>Dishonest.</i></p> <p>Found proved in respect of charge 3. Not proved in respect of charge 4.</p> <p>The Committee applied the two-staged test for dishonesty in <i>Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd (t/a Crockfords)</i> [2017] UKSC 67, namely: (i) what was Miss Woodfine's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts; and (ii) was such conduct dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people?</p> <p>In respect of charge 3, the Committee determined that Miss Woodfine was being deliberately misleading to the GDC. She knew she was under a duty</p>



	<p>to inform the GDC of the criminal proceedings to which she was subject, as she had immediately informed it of her drink driving conviction. However, she did not inform it that she had also been convicted on that same date of failing to stop after an accident which she had been involved in whilst drink driving. The GDC specifically asked her to provide “<i>any documentation provided to you by the police</i>” in relation to the drink driving conviction, in response to which she claimed she had already “<i>got rid</i>” of the charge sheet and had no paperwork relating to the proceedings.</p> <p>The Committee determined that in the communications which followed between Miss Woodfine and the GDC, she had ample opportunity to disclose the fact of this second conviction but chose not to do so. She instead stated in an email on 30 March 2023 that: “<i>I was caught drink driving and now I’m banned for 18month that’s all <u>nothing more nothing less</u></i>” (underlined emphasis added). The Committee determined that this had the effect of failing to properly reflect the full seriousness of her offending behaviour, namely the failure to stop after a traffic accident which occurred under the influence of alcohol.</p> <p>The Committee determined that Miss Woodfine was being deliberately misleading to the GDC in order to minimise the extent of her criminal offending as part of its regulatory “scrutiny” of her fitness to practise in relation to her drink driving conviction. Such conduct would clearly be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.</p> <p>In respect of charge 4, the Committee was not satisfied from the available evidence that Miss Woodfine’s state of mind was one of deliberately attempting to mislead the GDC, or of otherwise acting dishonestly. There could be multiple explanations for her failure to have cooperated with the GDC’s investigation with dishonesty being no more likely than, for example, irritation or frustration at what might have been perceived by her as unnecessary and intrusive requests for information.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved in respect of charge 3 and not proved in respect of charge 4.</p>
6.	<p><i>You have an adverse mental or physical health condition as set out in Schedule A.</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>[IN PRIVATE]</p>

Accordingly, the Committee found this charge proved.
--

26. We move to Stage Two.

Stage Two 26 February 2025

27. At this stage of the proceedings the Committee shall decide whether any or all of the facts found proved under charges 3-5(a)-(b) amount to misconduct and, if so, whether Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise as a dental nurse is currently impaired by reason of that misconduct. The Committee shall also decide whether Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her convictions at charges 1 and 2 and/or by reason of the adverse health condition(s) found proved under charge 6.

28. If the Committee finds current impairment on any of these grounds, it shall then decide on what action, if any, to take in respect of Miss Woodfine's registration.

29. Ms Michaels submitted that the facts found proved under charges 3-5(a)-(b) amount to misconduct and that Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of that misconduct. She submitted that Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is also currently impaired by reason of her convictions and her adverse physical or mental health.

30. Ms Michaels submitted that the appropriate outcome in this case is that of erasure.

31. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

32. The Committee had regard to the *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, last revised December 2020).

Conviction

33. The Committee first considered whether Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of either or both her convictions. In the Committee's judgment, her fitness to practise is clearly impaired in respect of both. Miss Woodfine was not marginally over the limit but was some three times over the prescribed limit of alcohol. She was involved in an accident with another vehicle whilst intoxicated but failed to stop at the scene and instead drove away. These were serious matters which had the potential to cause harm to others and which are damaging to the reputation of the profession.

34. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise as a dental nurse is currently impaired by reason of her convictions.

Misconduct

35. The Committee next considered whether the facts found proved under charges 3-5(a)-(b) amount to misconduct.
36. Misconduct is a serious departure from the standards reasonably expected of a dental professional. In assessing whether the relevant facts found proved, or any of them, amount to misconduct, the Committee had regard to the following principles from the GDC's *Standards for the Dental Team* (September 2013):
- 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.
 - 9.3.1 You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world. See our guidance on reporting criminal proceedings for more information.
 - 9.4 You must co-operate with any relevant formal or informal inquiry and give full and truthful information.
 - 9.4.1 If you receive a letter from the GDC in connection with concerns about your fitness to practise, you must respond fully within the time specified in the letter. You should also seek advice from your indemnity provider or professional association.
37. The guidance on reporting criminal proceedings referred to under standard 9.3.1 identifies both being charged and being convicted as matters about which dental professionals must immediately inform the GDC.
38. The findings of fact under charges 3-5(a)-(b) fall into two categories.
39. First (charges 3 and 5(a)-(b)), the failure to have informed the GDC, either immediately upon being charged or at all, of the criminal proceedings relating to the failing to stop after an accident conviction. This was a deliberate attempt to mislead the GDC in order to minimise the extent of her criminal offending as part of its regulatory scrutiny of her fitness to practise in relation to her disclosed drink driving conviction. Her actions were dishonest and were in clear breach of fundamental tenets of the profession.

40. Secondly (charge 4), the failure to have cooperated with the GDC's investigation into her fitness to practise by failing to provide it with information relating to her employment and indemnity arrangements despite repeated requests of her for this. Whilst the Committee did not find proved that her actions were misleading or dishonest, she was being deliberately obstructive to the GDC as part of its investigation. This undermined the role of the GDC as her regulator and was in clear breach of standards 9.4 and 9.4.1.
41. The Committee determined that the facts found proved in respect of all matters are serious and individually and cumulatively amount to misconduct.

Impairment by reason of misconduct

42. In assessing whether Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct, the Committee considered whether her misconduct is remediable, whether it had been remedied and the risk of repetition. The Committee also had regard to the wider public interest, which includes the need to uphold and declare appropriate standards of conduct and behaviour.
43. Miss Woodfine acted dishonestly towards her regulatory body in circumstances where she had ample opportunity to inform it of the additional conviction. She instead went so far as to declare to it that she had been convicted of "*nothing more nothing less*" than the drink driving offence. Having regard to the Police report, which records that she initially denied in various ways that she was the driver and her level of alcohol consumption, her dishonesty appears to form a pattern of behaviour. The Committee was mindful that dishonesty is attitudinal in nature and is therefore very difficult to remedy. Beyond her guilty plea, there was no evidence whatsoever before the Committee of any insight, reflection or remediation.
44. Miss Woodfine has not engaged in these proceedings in any meaningful way. She has instead expressed her disapproval of the GDC's regulatory involvement ("*I don't get why this keeps being reviewed as I am no longer dental nursing, please stop contacting me. I have repeatedly asked to be taken of the register it happened over 2 year ago so please just stop contacting me and wasting your time*"). In addition to her dishonesty, she also failed to cooperate with the GDC's investigation. She obstructed its ability to obtain information relating to her employment and indemnity. She has demonstrated conduct and an attitude which is wholly inconsistent with the standards which the public reasonably expect of dental professionals. Her misconduct is capable of bringing the reputation of the profession into disrepute.
45. The Committee could not be satisfied that the risk of her acting dishonestly again is low. The Committee also could not be satisfied that the risk of her failing to cooperate with the GDC's investigation again is low. Even at this final hearing some 2 years later, the GDC

still does not know her work history or indemnity status as she continues to fail to provide this information. The Committee determined that there is therefore a continuing risk of harm to the public and to the reputation of the profession.

46. The Committee therefore determined that Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise as a dental nurse is currently impaired by reason of misconduct.

Impairment by reason of adverse physical or mental health

47. The Committee next considered whether Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her adverse physical or mental health condition(s). [IN PRIVATE].

48. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Miss Woodfine's fitness to practise is not currently impaired by reason of adverse physical or mental health.

Sanction

49. The next consideration for the Committee was what action, if any, to take in respect of Miss Woodfine's registration. The purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it might have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest.

50. The Committee had regard to the aggravating and mitigating features present in this case.

51. The aggravating features include a risk of harm, dishonest conduct at the time of the commission of the index offence and dishonest conduct sustained over the period of her communications with the GDC, where she continued to fail to disclose the additional conviction; a blatant or wilful disregard for the role of the GDC and the systems governing the profession; and a persistent lack of insight.

52. In mitigation, the Committee recognised that Miss Woodfine has no fitness to practise history, that she had entered a guilty plea to both offences and that these were her first convictions.

53. The Committee considered sanction in ascending order of severity.

54. To conclude this case with no further action or a reprimand would be wholly inappropriate. This is because of the seriousness of Miss Woodfine's convictions and misconduct and the risk of repetition. A reprimand would be insufficient to protect the public and to meet the wider public interest.

55. The Committee next considered whether to direct that Miss Woodfine's registration be made subject to her compliance with conditions for a period of up to 36 months, with or without a review. The Committee could not identify any conditions which would be

sufficient to address Miss Woodfine's dishonesty and her non-cooperation with the GDC. The Committee could not in any event be satisfied that Miss Woodfine would comply with any conditions on her registration, owing to her lack of engagement at this hearing, her stated intention to leave the profession and the contempt towards the GDC's regulatory process which was apparent throughout much of her more recent email communications.

56. The Committee next considered whether to direct that Miss Woodfine's registration be suspended for a period of up to 12 months, with or without a review.
57. The Committee determined that a period of suspension would not be sufficient to mark the seriousness of Miss Woodfine's convictions and misconduct. In the absence of any evidence of insight and remediation, these matters are too serious for a period of suspension. There was also nothing to suggest to the Committee that Miss Woodfine would engage meaningfully or otherwise demonstrate any insight or remediation in 12 months' time, were her registration to be suspended. Her criminal offending, dishonesty towards the GDC and a lack of cooperation with its regulatory investigation are too highly damaging to public confidence in the profession for any lesser sanction than erasure to be appropriate. She has acted in a way which is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration.
58. The Committee therefore determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of erasure.
59. Accordingly, the Committee directs that Miss Woodfine's name be erased from the DCP register under the title of dental nurse.
60. The Committee now invites submissions on the question of an immediate order.
-
61. The interim order on Miss Woodfine's registration is hereby revoked.
62. The Committee is satisfied that it is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest to order that Miss Woodfine's registration be immediately suspended. It would be inconsistent with the decision the Committee has made not to make an immediate order.
63. The effect of this immediate order is that Miss Woodfine's registration shall be immediately suspended from when notice of this decision is duly served on her. Unless she exercises her right of appeal, her name shall be erased 28 days later. Should she exercise her right of appeal, this immediate order shall remain in force pending the disposal of the appeal.

64. That concludes this determination.