

HEARING HELD IN PRIVATE

Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

23 to 24 February 2026

Name: IVANOVA, Ivelina Yordanova

Registration number: 116199

Case number: CAS-187638-L9Q8P5

General Dental Council: Natalie Bird, Counsel
Instructed by Jalpa Patel, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Indefinite suspension confirmed

Committee members: Gregory Heath (Chair, Dentist Member)
Alan McCrum (Lay Member)
Clare Mcilwaine (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal Adviser: Charles Apthorp

Committee Secretary: Lola Bird

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

Ms Ivanova,

1. This is a resumed hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC), pursuant to Section 27C of the *Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)* ('the Act').
2. You are representing yourself at this hearing. The Case Presenter for the General Dental Council (GDC) is Ms Natalie Bird, Counsel.
3. The hearing commenced yesterday, 23 February 2026, when it was conducted in person at the Dental Professionals Hearings Service. The hearing was only scheduled to last for that one day. However, there was insufficient time to conclude all matters yesterday, so with the agreement of both parties, the Committee announced its decision at the end of yesterday's proceedings, with its written reasons being handed down remotely today, 24 February 2026.
4. The purpose of this hearing has been for the Committee to conduct a review of an indefinite suspension order that is currently in place on your registration. The indefinite suspension order was imposed by the PCC at the last resumed hearing of your case, which was in July 2022. At the time of that hearing in July 2022, your registration had been suspended for over two years, with an initial suspension order having been imposed in December 2019, followed by extensions of the order in December 2020, December 2021 and March 2022.

Decision on application to hold the hearing in private

5. At the outset of these proceedings, Ms Bird made an application for the entire hearing to be held in private, [PRIVATE]. Ms Bird made the application under Rule 53(2)(a) of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006*, which states that:

All or part of a hearing may be held in private—

where the interests of the parties or the protection of the private and family life of the respondent or any other person so requires;

6. Ms Bird also referred to the relevant paragraphs of the GDC's '*Guidance for the practice committees (January 2026)*' ('the PC Guidance'). It was her submission that the prudent course would be for the hearing to be held entirely private, as the matters to be considered are inextricably linked to [PRIVATE].
7. You confirmed that you were content for the hearing to proceed entirely in private.
8. Having heard from you and from Ms Bird, the Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who confirmed the Committee's discretion to hold all or part of the hearing in private. He advised that the Committee should balance the requirement for open justice with your right to a private and family life and [PRIVATE].

9. The Committee determined to accede to the application for a wholly private hearing. In doing so, it noted that the matters to be considered are inextricably linked to [PRIVATE]. The Committee considered Rule 53(2)(a) and the relevant paragraphs of the PC Guidance to be clear, and it was satisfied that it was necessary and appropriate for the entire hearing to proceed in private for the protection of your private and family life [PRIVATE].

10. As is the usual practice in the circumstances, the Committee has produced both a private version, and a suitably redacted public version, of its determination. The Committee took into account paragraph 61 of the PC Guidance which states that public reasons should be given where it is possible to do so without undermining the purpose of allowing the hearing to proceed in private.

Summary of the case background

11. At the initial hearing of your case which took place from 9 to 10 December 2019, the PCC considered and found proved allegations in relation to your conduct and your convictions. You attended that initial hearing and you represented yourself.

12. The allegations had been referred to the PCC by way of two separate referrals from the GDC's Case Examiners. The first referral was based on information provided to the Council following a police interview you attended on 24 January 2017 and [PRIVATE]. The second referral related to the fact of your convictions, which was information that came to light during the GDC's investigation of the matters relating to the first referral.

13. With regard to your convictions, you admitted, and the initial PCC found proved, that on 23 June 2017, you were convicted at Northern Derbyshire Magistrates of the following offences:

- failing to stop after an accident on 10/11/16 contrary to the Road Traffic Act 1988 s.170(4); and
- driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road/ in a public place without due care and attention on 10/11/16 contrary to the Road Traffic Act 1988 s.3.

14. The conduct matters found proved by the initial PCC covered three distinct aspects. [PRIVATE].

15. The second aspect was your failure, in breach of your professional obligations, to have immediately informed the GDC of the criminal charges leading to your convictions and of the convictions themselves. You admitted these failings and also admitted that your conduct in not informing the GDC of the criminal matters was misleading.

16. You further admitted the third aspect of your conduct, which was your failure to have cooperated with an ensuing investigation by the GDC into your fitness to practise.

17. The initial PCC determined that each of the conduct matters it found proved represented conduct that fell far short of the standards reasonably to be expected of a general dental practitioner and amounted to misconduct. It further determined that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct and by reason of your convictions.

18. However, in finding that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of misconduct, the initial PCC noted, in particular, your lack of insight into, and remediation of, the misconduct arising from [PRIVATE] and your failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation. The initial PCC stated the following in its determination:

[PRIVATE].

The Committee considers that your failure to co-operate with and notify the GDC is remediable, and that you have demonstrated evidence of your insight into and reflections upon your particular failure to inform the Council of your criminal charges and criminal convictions. The Committee considers that in the circumstances it is unlikely that there will be a repeat of your failure to notify the GDC of future matters that you are required to declare. However, the Committee notes that there is evidence to suggest that there has been some continuation of your failure to co-operate with the GDC, notwithstanding your participation in this hearing. This suggests that you have not sufficiently remedied the misconduct that has been found in relation to that failure to co-operate.

... The Committee therefore considers that your fitness to practise is therefore currently impaired.

The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. The public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the misconduct that the Committee has identified."

19. In relation to the issue of your convictions, the initial PCC stated that:

"The Committee has determined that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your convictions. The Committee is particularly concerned by your offence of failing to stop after an accident that you had caused. The Committee considers that in the circumstances a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. The public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the serious nature of the criminal offences for which you were convicted."

20. By way of a sanction, the initial PCC directed that your registration be suspended for a period of 12 months. It also directed that a review of the suspension order should take place shortly before the expiry of the 12-month period. In directing the review, the initial PCC stated that:

"Although the Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the reviewing Committee, that future Committee may be assisted by evidence of you having developed and demonstrated insight into your misconduct. That Committee may in particular be assisted by a reflective piece setting out your reflections on how and why you should have behaved differently and what measures and steps you have put in place to prevent of repeat of conduct which is so damaging to your fitness to practise"

First review of the order – 23 December 2020

21. You attended a resumed hearing before the PCC in December 2020, and you again represented yourself. At that review, that Committee determined that your fitness to practise

remained impaired by reason of your misconduct and your convictions. It stated the following in its determination:

“...Aside from your oral evidence there is no other material before this Committee that you have addressed your past misconduct/conviction or provided any information as recommended to you by the PCC on 10 December 2019. The Committee notes you were sent a reminder of the recommendations made at the initial hearing in August 2020, but no response was received. The Committee considers that your oral evidence is not sufficient to satisfy it that you have addressed all of the concerns identified by the PCC at the initial hearing. The Committee also has concerns as to your level of insight, given that there is no evidence of reflection to demonstrate a full understanding of your failures and the wider impact of those failures on your practice and the profession generally and your actions to date to address them. Given its concerns regarding your level of insight, the absence of any meaningful remediation, the Committee considers that the risk of repetition remains. It notes that it is for you to satisfy this Committee that you have addressed all aspects of impairment found by the initial PCC and it is not persuaded that you have done so. Accordingly, the Committee has concluded that your fitness to practise remains currently impaired by reason of your misconduct and conviction.”

22. The PCC in December 2020 extended the suspension order on your registration by a period of 12 months. In directing a further review of the order, that Committee reiterated the recommendations made by the initial PCC in 2019.

Second review of the order – 14 December 2021

23. A further review of the suspension order was undertaken by the PCC at a resumed hearing held on 14 December 2021. You were neither present nor represented on that occasion, although the PCC had before it a copy of your witness statement, which you had provided in an email dated 12 December 2021.

24. It was noted that in your witness statement, you addressed the matter of your convictions and your misconduct in failing to notify the GDC. You stated that:

“Regarding the criminal charges and conviction after the accident in November 2016, when I collided with another car, I realize that I did not follow the rules and I was wrong. From now on, I will stop and notify the police authorities immediately, or I will find a suitable place to park the car, to be possible wait for the police, while not obstructing the traffic. I know, that I am obliged to inform the GDC about the imposed sanctions. In case, something like this happens again, which I sincerely hope not to happen, I will have to inform the GDC. I understand, that my actions affect people's trust and my position in the dental profession”.

25. It was noted by the PCC in December 2021 that you had not provided any *“further reflective statement or other evidence of remediation for the Committee’s consideration ...”*.

26. The Committee in December 2021 determined that your fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of your misconduct and your convictions *“for substantially the same reasons expressed by the previous PCCs”*. The PCC in December 2021 extended the suspension order by a period of three months, stating in its determination:

“In the Committee’s judgment, the suspension of Ms Ivanova’s registration remains necessary and proportionate. The Committee considers that extending the suspension by 3

months is sufficient to allow Ms Ivanova an opportunity to engage in further reflection and to provide the reviewing Committee with evidence of further remediation. The period is also sufficient to give the reviewing Committee the power to direct indefinite suspension, if it considers that to be appropriate.”

Third review of the order - 9 March 2022

27. A third review of the suspension order was undertaken by the PCC at a resumed hearing held on 9 March 2022. You were neither present nor represented on that occasion. In relation to the issue of your impairment by reason of your convictions, that Committee stated:

“The Committee took into account that Ms Ivanova specifically addressed her convictions in her witness statement provided at the last PCC review. Her witness statement included her recognition of her wrongdoing, and reference to how she would behave differently in future if faced with similar circumstances with the police. This Committee acknowledged the concerns raised at the previous hearing about the extent of Ms Ivanova’s insight and remediation in general in this case. Whilst it considered that Ms Ivanova could have addressed her reflection on her convictions more comprehensively in her witness statement, in terms of today’s review, the Committee considered that there was not much more that she could have added in respect of the criminal matters. Taking this into account, and having had regard to the time elapsed since her convictions, with no evidence of repetition, the Committee determined that Ms Ivanova’s fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of her convictions.”

28. In relation to the matter of your misconduct, the PCC in March 2022 determined that:

“The Committee was satisfied for the same reasons as given in relation the convictions, that Ms Ivanova’s fitness to practise is no longer impaired in relation to the second aspect of her misconduct. It considered that there is evidence in her witness statement provided in respect of the last PCC review, that Ms Ivanova appreciates the importance of keeping her regulatory body informed of matters such as criminal proceedings. In this regard she stated, “In case, something like this happens again, which I sincerely hope not to happen, I will have to inform the GDC. I understand, that my actions affect people’s trust and my position in the dental profession”. The Committee again considered that, for the purposes of this review, there would not have been much more that Ms Ivanova could had added to demonstrate her insight and understanding.

However, the Committee was greatly concerned about the absence of any evidence from Ms Ivanova’s reflection or insight in relation to the first aspect of her misconduct. She was completely silent on this matter in her witness statement provided on the last occasion. The Committee noted that it was stated to Ms Ivanova by PCC in December 2020 that, [IN PRIVATE].

In the absence of any evidence of remorse, reflection or insight into the first aspect of her misconduct, the Committee considered that there was an ongoing risk of repetition. It considered that the nature of this aspect of Ms Ivanova’s misconduct, [IN PRIVATE], raised serious concerns about public safety. The Committee therefore determined that a finding of impairment was necessary on the grounds of public protection.

The Committee also considered that a finding of impairment was required in the wider public interest, to maintain public confidence in the dental profession, and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of behaviour. The Committee had regard to Standard 9.1 of the GDC’s Standards for the Dental Team (September 2013), which states that: “You must: Ensure that your conduct, both at work and in your personal life, justifies patients’ trust in you and the public’s trust in the dental profession”. In the Committee’s view, a reasonable and

informed member of the public would be concerned if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances, given Ms Ivanova's breach of this fundamental requirement of the profession.

Accordingly, the Committee determined that Ms Ivanova's fitness to practise remains impaired on the basis of the first aspect of her misconduct only, [IN PRIVATE]."

29. In relation to sanction, the PCC in March 2022 determined:

"The Committee determined to extend the current order of suspension on Ms Ivanova's registration by a period of 4 months. It considered that a 4-month period would continue to provide protection the public, and that it would satisfy the public interest, particularly given that the Committee also directs a further review.

...

This Committee wishes to make clear that its outstanding concerns relate to [IN PRIVATE]. In this regard, the Committee considered that a reviewing Committee may be assisted by the following:

- *Ms Ivanova's attendance at the resumed hearing, which would enable that Committee to ask her questions.*
- *A written reflective piece from Ms Ivanova demonstrating her current insight into [IN PRIVATE].*
- *[IN PRIVATE]*
- *Evidence of any Continuing Professional Development (CPD) undertaken by Ms Ivanova [IN PRIVATE].*
- *Any other evidence that Ms Ivanova considers relevant to this case."*

Fourth review of the order - 21 July 2022

30. The order of suspension was further reviewed by the PCC at a resumed hearing held on 21 July 2022. That hearing took place on the basis of the papers alone, with neither party in attendance. It was noted that aside from an email dated 12 July 2022, in which you stated that you would not be attending the hearing and that there was nothing more you could add, no written representations were received from you.

31. In finding that your fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of your misconduct, the Committee in July 2022 stated that:

"There is no evidence before this Committee that Ms Ivanova has recognised the seriousness of her misconduct, demonstrated insight or provided any information as recommended to her by the previous reviewing PCC. It also notes that Ms Ivanova has not meaningfully engaged with the GDC in relation to these proceedings over a protracted period of time, despite repeated attempts by the GDC to secure her involvement. Given its concerns regarding Ms Ivanova's lack of insight and remediation the Committee considers that Ms Ivanova's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct."

32. That Committee directed that your registration should be suspended indefinitely under Section 27C(1)(d) of the Act, stating in its decision on sanction that:

“It has borne in mind Ms Ivanova’s lack of engagement with the GDC over a sustained period of time. Ms Ivanova did not attend the last two review hearings and aside from her witness statement dated 12 December 2021 which was provided to the second reviewing Committee, Ms Ivanova has not provided any information as set out in all the previous PCC’s recommendations. In these circumstances, the Committee has concluded that a further time limited period of suspension is unlikely to achieve her engagement or delivery of material requested to assist any future Committee. Further, Ms Ivanova’s email to the GDC dated 12 July 2022 suggests to the Committee that Ms Ivanova has no apparent intention of engaging with this case or undertaking any remediation. The Committee also notes that this matter has been on-going since 2019. The Committee concluded therefore in these circumstances an indefinite period of suspension is the appropriate and proportionate outcome and is required in order to maintain public protection and to maintain confidence in the profession...”

33. It was noted from the relevant provisions of the Act that you would not be able to seek a review of the indefinite suspension order until two years had elapsed from the date that the order took effect.

This current review

34. It has been over two years since the indefinite suspension order imposed on your registration in July 2022 took effect. In accordance with Section 27(4) of the Act, you made a request to the GDC for a review of the order, hence the convening of this hearing.

35. This is the fifth resumed hearing in respect of the matter and the first review of the current indefinite suspension order. The documentary evidence before the Committee at this review includes your written reflective piece dated 18 February 2026, the evidence of your Continuing Professional Development (CPD), [PRIVATE] and a testimonial tendered on your behalf by a dental colleague based in Bulgaria. The Committee also took account of your oral evidence given at this hearing.

36. In addition, the Committee heard submissions made by Ms Bird on behalf of the GDC and submissions from you.

37. In opening the matter for the GDC, Ms Bird informed the Committee that your registration is currently subject to another indefinite suspension order, which was imposed on your registration in December 2020. She submitted that that indefinite suspension order is in respect of matters unrelated to the issue before this Committee, and in the circumstances, the GDC did not consider it appropriate to join the cases together for a review. Ms Bird told the Committee that the other indefinite suspension order would be reviewed by a different Committee later this week.

38. In her initial submissions to the Committee in respect of this case, Ms Bird stated that the GDC’s position was that your fitness to practise remains impaired, [PRIVATE].

39. By way of an update since the last resumed hearing in July 2022, Ms Bird submitted that your non-engagement with the GDC had continued up until December 2025, which is when you sent an email to the Council requesting a review of the current indefinite suspension order. Ms Bird stated that there was an indication that you had made an earlier request for a review in 2024, but it appeared that request was not followed through by you.

40. Ms Bird went on to address the Committee in relation to the legal provisions, principles and guidance applicable at this review, including paragraph 304 of the PC Guidance in relation to resumed hearings, which sets out that:

“At this stage, the onus is on the registrant to demonstrate that their fitness to practise is no longer impaired i.e. they acknowledge the deficiencies identified at the initial hearing and have sufficiently addressed them”.

41. Ms Bird referred to the recommendations made by the last PCC in July 2022 in terms of the evidence it considered might be helpful for you to provide at any next review. [PRIVATE].

42. In relation to the other recommendations made by the last PCC, Ms Bird noted that you have provided a written reflective piece which, she submitted, shows some, but not full insight, into your misconduct. It was Ms Bird’s submission that there remains a lack of reflection on your part [PRIVATE].

43. Ms Bird also asked the Committee to remain mindful of the issue of your potential de-skilling, given that you have not practised as a dentist in the UK for some 10 years on account of the various suspension orders that have been in place on your registration. Whilst Ms Bird noted the evidence that you have been practising in Bulgaria, she submitted that this Committee can only address concerns relating to this jurisdiction. It was Ms Bird’s submission that there is insufficient evidence at this review to demonstrate ongoing clinical competence, and as such, there would be a risk to the public if you were to return to practice, even with conditions.

44. Furthermore, Ms Bird invited the Committee to note that the GDC had sent you a ‘Cease and Desist’ letter in 2023, after noting that you were still using the protected title of ‘Dentist’ on your LinkedIn page. Ms Bird stated that the matter was not pursued any further as you subsequently took the reference down. She submitted, however, that it may be considered that this matter raises ongoing concerns about your ability to comply with and understand relevant regulations, which was a feature of the original allegations at the initial PCC hearing in 2019.

45. Ms Bird submitted that the lack of evidence of insight and reflection in this case, coupled with the concern about your de-skilling, means that there is a continued risk to the public and the wider public interest, such that you should not be permitted to return to clinical practice even under conditions. Ms Bird submitted, however, that if the Committee were minded to impose conditions, they should include [PRIVATE] and require the direct supervision of your work.

46. The Committee next heard your oral evidence in which you referred the Committee to your written reflective piece [PRIVATE]. You stated that the events in question happened more than nine years ago, but that you were happy to give details about the matters by answering any questions put to you.

47. [PRIVATE].

48. You were also asked questions in cross-examination by Ms Bird, [PRIVATE] and your view of the impact of that misconduct, including on the public's perception of the dental profession as a whole. [PRIVATE]. In addition to the questions put to you by Ms Bird, you answered a number of questions from the Committee, including in relation to the evidence of your CPD.

49. Following your oral evidence, Ms Bird confirmed that the GDC's position remained that your fitness to practise is currently impaired, and that the indefinite suspension order should be confirmed. She submitted that your answers in your oral evidence demonstrated your inability to understand the impact of your previous actions and history with regard to public perception, the dental standards and [PRIVATE]. Ms Bird submitted that, in the circumstances, a reasonable and informed member of the public would not be satisfied that you are a suitable candidate to return to the practise of dentistry.

50. [PRIVATE].

The Committee's decisions – made on 23 February 2026

51. In comprehensively reviewing the indefinite suspension order, the Committee considered all the evidence placed before it, both documentary and oral. It took account of the submissions made by Ms Bird and your submissions.

52. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the applicable legal principles, guidance, the approach it should take in conducting its review and the need to give reasons for its decisions.

Decision on current impairment

53. The Committee first considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct [PRIVATE]. In doing so, the Committee exercised its independent judgement. It had regard to the overarching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety, and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.

54. It was the view of the Committee that there is very limited evidence before it in relation to your insight, remorse and remediation. In reaching its conclusion, the Committee had regard to your written reflective piece but was not satisfied that it addressed the core issues in this case. The Committee considered that it included little evidence of your reflection on what you perceive are the relevant matters relating to your practice as a dentist.

55. Whilst the Committee took into account the CPD that you have undertaken [PRIVATE], its assessment was that you appeared to have a transactional approach to your learning and development, and as such, your written reflections are primarily a repetition of what you learnt. In the Committee's view, your written reflections do not contain any real evidence of your understanding of how your learning [PRIVATE] applies to your past behaviour and what you now consider that you should have done differently in the circumstances. The Committee further took into account that the behaviour in question occurred nine years ago, whilst your CPD [PRIVATE] was undertaken very

recently, in fact just days before this hearing. The Committee expected that you would have undertaken your learning and reflection on the matter much sooner.

56. In relation to your oral evidence given at this hearing, the Committee noted your recognition that your past behaviour was unacceptable, [PRIVATE]. The Committee found that there was no real demonstration of remorse or apology for what you did, and it considered that there was very little substance to the answers you provided during questioning.

57. Given its concerns about your level of insight, remorse and remediation, the Committee concluded that it could not be confident that the risk of repetition in this case is low. It therefore determined that a finding of current impairment is necessary for the protection of the public. In reaching its decision, the Committee noted the issue raised by the GDC in relation to your potential de-skilling as a dentist. However, it bore in mind that the matters in this case relate specifically to matters of your behaviour.

58. The Committee also determined that a finding of current impairment is in the wider public interest, to maintain public confidence in the dental profession and to uphold proper professional standards. The Committee took into account that you were questioned a number of times during your oral evidence about what members of the public might think about your past behaviour. Whilst you acknowledged the “*bad impact*” on the reputation of the wider dental profession, the Committee was not satisfied that you gave an adequate explanation for why you thought this might be the case, nor did you offer any apology for your misconduct. It was the view of the Committee that you did not seem to grasp how your personal life can affect your professional life or the public’s perception of the profession as a whole.

59. Accordingly, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct [PRIVATE]. This is because the Committee has not been satisfied that you have taken clear steps to remedy those past actions.

Decision on sanction

60. The Committee next considered what action to take in respect of your registration. It had regard to section 27C(5) of the Act, which sets out the options available to it at this review. The Committee also took into account the PC Guidance. It noted that the purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your interests.

61. Given the Committee’s view in relation to the very limited evidence of insight, remorse and remediation, it concluded that it would be wholly inappropriate to terminate the current indefinite suspension order currently in place on your registration. The Committee considered that some restriction of your registration remained necessary to protect the public and the wider public interest.

62. The Committee next considered whether it could replace the current indefinite suspension order with a conditions of practice order. However, it concluded that it could not formulate any workable conditions that would address the identified risk in this case, which arises from issues

relating to your behaviour and attitude, as opposed to any clinical findings. Furthermore, whilst no longer being considered at this stage, the Committee took into account that you have a history of non-engagement with the GDC. Taking all these factors into account, the Committee was not satisfied that conditional registration would be appropriate or proportionate to protect the public, nor would such a sanction address the wider public interest considerations in this case.

63. The Committee therefore determined that the only appropriate and proportionate course of action is to confirm and continue to the current indefinite suspension order on your registration.

64. The Committee noted that in accordance with the relevant provision of the Act, you are unable to apply for another review of the indefinite suspension order until two years have elapsed from the date that this direction to confirm the order has taken effect.

65. This Committee does not seek to fetter the discretion of any future reviewing Committee. However, it considered that should you wish to apply for a further review of the indefinite suspension order after the relevant period has elapsed, that next Committee might find it helpful to receive the following evidence from you:

- Your attendance at the resumed hearing, which would enable that Committee to ask you questions.
- A further written reflective piece demonstrating your insight [PRIVATE] and the impact of your behaviour on the reputation of the wider dental profession.
- Evidence of any Continuing Professional Development (CPD) you have undertaken in relation to [PRIVATE] and your reflections of what you have learned, and how it is applicable to you both personally and professionally.
- [PRIVATE].
- Any other evidence that you consider would be helpful to the Committee.

66. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, this direction to confirm the current indefinite suspension on your registration will take effect, 28 days from the date that notice of this direction is deemed to have been served upon you. In the event that you do exercise your right of appeal, the current indefinite suspension order will remain in place until the resolution of the appeal.

67. That concludes this determination.