

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

16 – 18 March 2026

Name: WHITE, Hannah
Registration number: 284976
Case number: CAS-210142-Y3M0Y7

General Dental Council: Mr Christopher Saad, counsel.
Instructed by Saba Khan, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome: Erased with Immediate Suspension
Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Tanya Viehoff (DCP Member and Chair)
Vatsal Amin (Dentist Member)
Jeannett Martin (Lay Member)

Legal Adviser: Valerie Paterson

Committee Secretary: Sarah Crewe

Hannah Susan WHITE, a dental nurse, Diploma in Dental Nursing Level 3 QCF City & Guilds 2019 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 16 March 2026 for an inquiry into the following charge:

“That being a registered dental nurse:

Submission of whitening tray prescriptions without prescription

1. *On or around 25 August 2023, you submitted a whitening tray prescription in respect of yourself without it being appropriately prescribed;*
2. *On or around 1 November 2023 you submitted a whitening tray prescription in respect of yourself without it being appropriately prescribed;*

Providing teeth whitening gel to others without authorisation

3. *In or around 2022, you offered teeth whitening gel owned by the Practice to a member of staff [Witness D] for free without the Practice’s authorisation and without a prescription;*
4. *In or around 2023, you offered teeth whitening gel owned by the Practice to a member of staff [Witness D] for free without the Practice’s authorisation and without a prescription;*
5. *On or between August and September 2023, you provided teeth whitening gel owned by the Practice to a member of staff [Witness B] for free without the Practice’s authorisation and without a prescription;*

1 November 2023

6. *On or around 1 November 2023, you took an envelope containing £168 of the Practice’s money without the Practice’s authorisation;*
7. *On a date other than in allegation 6, you took £500 of the Practice’s money without the Practice’s authorisation;*
8. *On or around 1 November 2023, you took four syringes of teeth whitening gel from a secure cupboard at the Practice without the Practice’s authorisation;*

Scope

9. *Your conduct in respect of 5 was outside of your scope of practice.*

Dishonesty

10. *Your actions in respect of 1 and/or 2 were dishonest in that you knew you did not have the required prescription in respect of those submissions;*
11. *Your actions in respect of 3 and/or 4 and/or 5 and/or 6 and/or 7 and/or 8 were dishonest in that you knew you did not have the required authorisation in respect of those acts.*

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

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee hearing in relation to a case brought by the General Dental Council (GDC) against Miss Hannah White.

2. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.

3. Miss White is not present at the hearing, and she is not represented in her absence. The Case Presenter for the GDC is Mr Chris Saad, Counsel.

Application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the registrant – 16 March 2026

4. At the outset, Mr Saad made an application pursuant to Rule 54 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006* ('the Rules'), to proceed with the hearing notwithstanding Miss White's absence.

5. Mr Saad drew the Committee's attention to the relevant documents in respect of service. He submitted that there has been good service and this is further demonstrated by Miss White's response to the notice. He also submitted that the Committee can rightly conclude from her communications with the GDC that she does not wish to attend this hearing. In all the circumstances, Mr Saad invited the Committee to continue in Miss White's absence.

6. The Committee took account of Mr Saad's submissions, and the supporting documentation provided. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to service and proceeding with a hearing in the absence of a registrant.

Decision on service

7. The Committee first considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Miss White in accordance with Rules 13 and 65. It had sight of the Notice of Hearing, which is dated 4 February 2026 ('the notice').

8. The notice was sent to Miss White's registered address by Special Delivery and First-Class post. The Committee noted that the copy of the notice sent by Special Delivery was delivered and signed for in the name 'HANNAH' on 5 February 2026. However, it took into account that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove delivery of the notice, only that it was sent. The Committee was satisfied on the evidence provided that the GDC complied with the requirement to send notice.

9. The Committee further took into account that on 4 February 2026, a copy of the notice was sent to Miss White by email, and that she responded by email to the GDC on 11 February 2026 to confirm she would not be attending this hearing.

10. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Miss White complied with the 28-day notice period specified in the Rules. It was also satisfied that the notice contained all the required particulars, including the date and time of the hearing, confirmation that the hearing would be conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams, and that the Committee had the power to proceed in Miss White's absence.

11. On the basis of all the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that Miss White was duly notified of the hearing in accordance with the Rules.

Decision on whether to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the registrant

12. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss White. It approached this issue with the utmost care and caution. The Committee took account of the factors to be considered in reaching its decision, as set out in relevant case law, including the case of *General Medical Council v Adeogba*.

13. The Committee bore in mind that fairness to Miss White is an important consideration. It was also mindful of the need to be fair to the GDC, and of the public interest in the expeditious disposal of this case.

14. The Committee was satisfied that Miss White is aware of this hearing. It noted that she has engaged with the GDC to some extent, in that she has responded to emails that have been sent to her. However, the Committee considered it clear from Miss White's communications that she does not wish to participate in these fitness to practise proceedings. It noted that in her email of 11 February 2026 she stated "*I write to formally notify you that I will not be attending the hearing listed for March.*"

15. In all the circumstances, it was the view of the Committee that adjourning the hearing would serve no meaningful purpose. Miss White has not requested an adjournment, and there is no indication that deferring the hearing would secure her attendance on a future date. The Committee considered it clear that Miss White has voluntarily absented herself.

16. The Committee considered fairness to the GDC, including the potential inconvenience that may cause to its witnesses by any delay. It also considered its duty to act expeditiously in the public interest. The Committee concluded that without good reason for deferring the matters, the hearing should proceed as scheduled. It determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in Miss White's absence.

Application for Hearing to be held in Private – 16 March 2026

17. At the beginning of the hearing, Mr Saad made an application for the hearing to take place partly in private pursuant to Rule 53(1) and (2) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the Rules). Mr Saad submitted that the reason for the application was because there may be references to Miss White's health and reference to another matter that relates to Miss White's private life.

18. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.

19. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session as there is a clear public interest in the transparency of regulatory proceedings. However, the Committee noted that this needed to be balanced with the need to protect Miss White's private life, including matters relating to health. The Committee concluded that any references to Miss White's health and any reference to her private life should be heard in private, but the rest of the hearing will remain in public. It also considered that a suitably redacted determination would be produced, which would include the Committee's reasons for its decision without disclosing any matters regarding Miss White's health, and that this would satisfy the public interest for transparency.

20. The Committee therefore acceded to the application and determined that the hearing should be conducted in private when referencing Miss White's health and private life.

Case background

21. The charges against Miss White relates to submission of whitening tray prescriptions without prescription, providing tooth whitening gel to others without authorization and/or prescription, and removing cash and tooth whitening syringes from the practice without authorisation. Further, Miss White acted outside of her scope of practice, and in a dishonest manner.

Evidence

22. The evidence received by the Committee included oral evidence from the GDC's witnesses, and witness statements and associated exhibits provided.

23. The documentary evidence before the Committee included, but was not limited to, the following:

- Signed Expert Report
- Statement of Witness B and associated exhibits
- Statement of Witness C and associated exhibits
- Statement of Witness D and associated exhibits
- Statement of Witness E and associated exhibits
- Statement of Witness F and associated exhibits
- Statement of Witness A and associated exhibits

The Committee's findings of fact – 17 March 2026

24. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It considered each head of charge separately, bearing in mind that the burden of proof rests with the GDC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is, whether the alleged matters are proved on the balance of probabilities.

25. The Committee factual findings are as follows:

1.	<p><i>Submission of whitening tray prescriptions without prescription</i> <i>On or around 25 August 2023, you submitted a whitening tray prescription in respect of yourself without it being appropriately prescribed;</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>The Committee had before it a copy of the prescription that was completed by Miss White and included a note to contact her for payment. The Committee accepted that this was sufficient to demonstrate that Miss White had submitted a prescription for a tooth whitening tray in respect of herself. There was no evidence before the Committee to show that the tooth whitening tray was prescribed by a dentist or that a dentist had been involved at all. The evidence before the Committee shows that there was no name included for the prescriber, and it was not made out for a patient, but rather for a Miss White.</p> <p>The Committee heard from three witnesses who outlined what an appropriate prescription would contain, and this prescription was not done appropriately and there was no evidence that a dentist had been involved in the prescribing. Witness A informed the Committee that the notation on the prescription form states to contact the registrant for payment, which is against practice policy. The form is also completed in Miss White's handwriting and has Miss White as the</p>
----	--

	<p>patient rather than any real registered patient. She stated that there is a procedure in place that has been there for 20 years, and Miss White had no permission to deviate from that. She referred to this as a fundamental departure from procedure. This was supported by two further witnesses who stated that the dental nurses would fill out the patient details but the dentist would have to complete the specifics for the prescription.</p> <p>In her written statement Miss White submitted that <i>'The first impressions were for a patient of the practice & were taken by a registered dentist during a pre-arranged appointment in August 2023, at this appointment the registered dentist also instructed on the use of whitening gel, details of this patient's appointment with the dentist should be held within the practice's electronic diary'</i>. Based on all of the evidence before it, the Committee did not accept this explanation from Miss White as she had put her own name in the 'patient' details box on the form and the 'surgeon' box was left blank.</p> <p>In the circumstances, the Committee found head of charge 1 proved on the balance of probabilities.</p>
2.	<p><i>On or around 1 November 2023 you submitted a whitening tray prescription in respect of yourself without it being appropriately prescribed;</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>In reaching its decision, the Committee had regard to the considerations at charge 1 and sight of a copy of the prescription. This prescription had Miss White as the patient and she had written 'staff' as the prescriber. Ms Nichols, the GDC Expert, stated that this was inappropriate and was as useful as leaving the prescriber blank.</p> <p>In her written statement Miss White submitted that <i>'The second impression was for my Father, it was taken under the guidance of a registered dentist and not in isolation by myself'</i>. Based on all of the evidence before it, the Committee did not accept this explanation from Miss White as the 'patient' box did not contain her father's name, instead she had put her own name and the 'surgeon' box was filled out with 'staff'.</p> <p>The Committee was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Miss White submitted a whitening tray in respect of herself without it being appropriately prescribed. Accordingly, head of charge 2 is proved.</p>
3.	<p><i>Providing teeth whitening gel to others without authorisation</i> <i>In or around 2022, you offered teeth whitening gel owned by the Practice to a member of staff [Witness D] for free without the Practice's authorisation and without a prescription;</i></p>
4	<p><i>In or around 2023, you offered teeth whitening gel owned by the Practice to a member of staff [Witness D] for free without the Practice's authorisation and without a prescription;</i></p>
5	<p><i>On or between August and September 2023, you provided teeth whitening gel owned by the Practice to a member of staff [Witness B] for free without the Practice's authorisation and without a prescription;</i></p> <p>All Found Proved.</p>

	<p>The Committee considered each head of charge separately.</p> <p>The Committee took into account the evidence of Witness D who told the Committee that Miss White was very blasé about the tooth whitening gel being free for staff, and made it sound like it was normal for staff to take it. Witness D said that she trusted Miss White because she was more senior. Witness D stated that she took the gel out of the cupboard herself after they had the conversation and Miss White confirmed she could take them and there would be no cost. Witness D told the Committee that a separate time she asked about gel for a friend and made it clear to Miss White that it was not for herself, and Miss White responded that she could just remove them from the spreadsheet as if they had never been in the building, it was said in a way that it seemed normal.</p> <p>Witness B told the Committee that she asked Miss White if there was any out of date tooth whitening available because as the head nurse she would know. Miss White said no but said Witness B could have some that was in date. Witness B asked how much and Miss White said nothing. Witness B said that she was in the rest room on the third floor getting changed at the time, Miss White left and returned before she had finished changing with the syringes. Witness B said she asked again if Miss White was sure no payment was needed and Miss White confirmed that this was the case.</p> <p>In her written statement Miss White submitted that <i>'I have no recollection of any staff member asking me how to use whitening gel or enquiring as to how they might pay for it , they would have understood that any treatment was conducted between themselves & their dentist'</i>. The Committee did not accept this account given the corroborating evidence of Witness B, Witness D and Witness C who all gave evidence about either being offered or provided with tooth whitening gel by Miss White on separate occasions.</p> <p>Taking all of the evidence into account, the Committee was satisfied that charges 4, 5 and 6 are found proved.</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>7.</p> <p>8.</p>	<p><i>On or around 1 November 2023, you took an envelope containing £168 of the Practice's money without the Practice's authorisation;</i></p> <p><i>On a date other than in allegation 6, you took £500 of the Practice's money without the Practice's authorisation;</i></p> <p><i>On or around 1 November 2023, you took four syringes of teeth whitening gel from a secure cupboard at the Practice without the Practice's authorisation;</i></p> <p>All Found Proved.</p> <p><i>The Committee was aware that Miss White had previously admitted that she took the envelope containing the money. This was both in written form as well as the oral evidence of Witness F who stated that Miss White admitted to taking the money and the gel and gave 'excuses' as to why she took them.</i></p> <p>The Committee also had sight of CCTV footage which showed Miss White taking syringes and an envelope from the 'lock cupboard'. This is supported by the witness evidence of four witnesses who gave evidence that Miss White had taken the tooth whitening gel to give to them.</p> <p>The Committee had information before it to suggest that Miss White accepted her actions to the police, and heard from Witness C that Miss White admitted to taking the money, and from Witness F who stated that Miss White admitted to taking the</p>

	<p>money and the tooth whitening gel. Miss White also stated that she took accountability for her actions in an email to the GDC. The Committee also had sight of an apology from Miss White and information that she returned £660 and a number of tooth whitening gel syringes.</p> <p>The Committee was satisfied, based on the CCTV footage and the oral evidence of Witness A who explained to the Committee that this was not authorized, that charges 6, 7 and 8 are found proved.</p>
9.	<p><i>Your conduct in respect of 5 was outside of your scope of practice;</i></p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee has already determined that charge 5 is proved and so next considered whether this was outside Miss White's scope of practice. The Committee had sight of the relevant section of the GDC Scope of Practice and heard from the Expert witness that a dental nurse providing tooth whitening gel without a prescription was outside of her scope of practice. The Committee accepted this and accordingly finds charge 9 proved.</p>
10.	<p><i>Your actions in respect of 1 and/or 2 were dishonest in that you knew you did not have the required prescription in respect of those submissions;</i></p>
11.	<p><i>Your actions in respect of 3 and/or 4 and/or 5 and/or 6 and/or 7 and/or 8 were dishonest in that you knew you did not have the required authorisation in respect of those acts.</i></p> <p>All Found Proved.</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 the actual state of the registrant's state of mind at the time, and, having taken account her state of mind, whether the registrant's conduct was dishonest by reference to the standards of an ordinary decent person. The registrant's own standards of honesty are not relevant.</p> <p>The Committee first of all reminded itself of its findings at heads of charge 1 to 8.</p> <p>The Committee has found that Miss White took monies and tooth whitening gel belonging to the practice without authorisation. The Committee was satisfied that Miss White, as the head nurse, would have been aware that taking these items was inappropriate. This is further demonstrated by Miss White telling a colleague that she would remove the syringes from the spreadsheet so that it would look like they were never in the building. This demonstrated to the Committee that she was attempting to cover up her actions.</p> <p>The Committee again notes the evidence presented to it that Miss White's employers suffered a financial loss as a result of her actions.</p> <p>The Committee considered that Miss White's conduct was dishonest by reference to the standards of an ordinary decent person and finds charges 10 and 11 proved.</p>

Stage Two of the hearing – 18 March 2026

26. At this second stage of the hearing, the Committee has had to consider whether Miss White's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct, and if so, whether her fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of misconduct. The Committee took into account that if it found current impairment on the statutory ground of misconduct, it would need to consider what sanction, if any, to impose on Miss White's registration.

27. In reaching its decisions, the Committee considered all the evidence presented to it at the fact-finding stage. It received no further evidence at this second stage.

28. The Committee took account of the submissions made by Mr Saad on behalf of the GDC in relation to misconduct, impairment and sanction. It also accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee bore in mind that its decisions were for its independent judgement. There is no burden or standard of proof at this stage of the proceedings.

Summary of the GDC's submissions

29. Mr Saad confirmed that Miss White has no fitness to practise history.

30. It was Mr Saad's submission that the facts found proved in this case amount to misconduct. He submitted that Miss White's conduct represents a serious departure from the GDC's '*Standards for the Dental Team*' (September 2013).

31. In relation to impairment, Mr Saad submitted that Miss White's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. He referred the Committee to the relevant sections of the PCC guidance in support of his submissions.

32. Mr Saad submitted that there is no evidence of any remediation or insight on the part of Miss White, so the Committee could not be reassured that her conduct would not be repeated. Furthermore, Mr Saad submitted that conduct of this type is likely to bring the reputation of the dental profession into disrepute.

33. Mr Saad submitted that the most appropriate and proportionate sanction in the circumstances of this case would be that of erasure. He submitted that any sanction less than erasure would not be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest.

Decision on misconduct

34. 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 facts that it 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.

7.2 You must work within your knowledge, skills, professional competence and abilities.

7.2.1 You must only carry out a task or a type of treatment if you are appropriately trained, competent, confident and indemnified. Training can take many different forms. You must be sure that you have undertaken training which is appropriate for you and equips you with the appropriate knowledge and skills to perform a task safely.

9.1 [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.

35. The Committee found as part of its factual determination that Miss White, on two separate occasions, took money from the practice that she was not entitled to, and removed tooth whitening gel syringes without authorisation. The Committee also found that Miss White submitted laboratory orders for whitening trays in her own name without the prescription from a dentist, and also provided tooth whitening gel to colleagues without authorisation or prescription from a dentist.

36. The Committee found that Miss White acted outside of her scope of practice and that her conduct was dishonest.

37. The Committee considers that Miss White's conduct fell far short of the standards reasonably expected of a dental nurse. Although the Committee has exercised its own independent judgment, the Committee noted the view of the GDC's expert witness regarding whether Miss White's conduct fell below or far below acceptable standards. The Committee finds that Miss White's conduct was deliberate, serious and persistent, and amounts to an abuse of her position of trust as a dental nurse and as the head nurse at the practice at which she worked. The Committee finds that Miss White's conduct would be considered by her fellow practitioners to be deplorable.

38. The Committee therefore finds that the facts that it has found proved amount to misconduct.

Decisions on impairment

39. The Committee next considered whether Miss White's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct. In doing so, it had regard to the over-arching 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.

40. Whilst the Committee viewed the misconduct to be serious, it considered that it is behaviour that is capable of being remedied. However, there is no evidence of genuine insight, remorse or remediation before the Committee. Miss White has not engaged in any meaningful way with these proceedings.

41. Although Miss White has stated that she acknowledges responsibility for her actions the Committee has no evidence to support this assertion or to suggest that she has undertaken any remediation. The acknowledgment of responsibility appears to be limited to taking money and tooth

whitening syringes from the practice, which she has since made repayment and made an apology for, but not to providing tooth whitening gel to colleagues, submitting tooth whitening trays without prescription or acting outside of her scope of practice. The Committee acknowledges the apology that Miss White made, however it was also aware that Miss White was directed to make this apology by the police and as such didn't consider that this necessarily demonstrated genuine insight.

42. In the absence of any evidence of remediation and the concern regarding Miss White's insight, the Committee concluded that there is a risk of repetition in relation to the misconduct identified. The Committee considered that a finding of impairment is required on public protection grounds.

43. The Committee was of the view that dental care professionals occupy a position of privilege and trust and must make sure that their conduct at all times justifies both their patients' and the public's trust in the profession. In this regard the Committee had regard to the approach to determining this issue formulated by Dame Janet Smith in her Fifth Report from Shipman.

44. The Committee determined that a finding of impairment in respect of Miss White's misconduct is in the wider public interest. It considered that a reasonable and informed member of the public would be alarmed if a finding of impairment were not made in relation to a dental professional who acted outside of scope and who stole money and tooth whitening gel from their employer. Miss White put her colleagues at risk of harm, brought the profession into disrepute and breached fundamental tenets of the profession. The Committee has already concluded that Miss White's conduct was dishonest. The Committee therefore concluded that public confidence in the dental profession would be seriously undermined in the absence of such a finding. It also took into account the need to uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

45. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Miss White's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct.

Decision on sanction

46. Having found Miss White's fitness to practise to be impaired, the Committee considered what sanction, if any, to impose on her registration. It bore in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and uphold the wider public interest. The Committee had regard to the GDC's '*Guidance for the Practice Committees including Indicative Sanctions Guidance*' (January 2026). It applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with Miss White's own interests.

47. The Committee identified what it considered to be the mitigating and aggravating factors in this case. In mitigation, the Committee took account of the following:

- Previous good character.
- Evidence of limited apology.

48. The Committee identified the following aggravating factors:

- Actual harm or risk of harm to a colleagues and the practice.
- Premeditated misconduct.
- Financial gain by the registrant.
- Abuse of trust/abuse of professional position.
- Misconduct sustained or repeated over a period of time.

- Lack of insight.

49. Taking all the above factors into account, the Committee considered the available sanctions, starting with the least restrictive. The Committee noted that it was open to it to conclude this case without taking any action in respect Miss White's registration. However, given the serious nature of her misconduct, and the identified risk of repetition, the Committee concluded that taking no action would not protect the public, nor would it satisfy the wider public interest.

50. The Committee therefore considered whether to issue Miss White with a reprimand. It concluded however, that the matters in this case are too serious for a reprimand, particularly Miss White taking money and tooth whitening gel from her employer. The Committee also took into account that it has identified an ongoing risk to the public and the wider public interest, and a reprimand would not impose any restrictions on Miss White's registration. In the circumstances, the Committee determined that a reprimand would not be sufficient, appropriate or proportionate.

51. The Committee next considered whether to impose a conditions of practice order on Miss White's registration. It decided that conditions would not address the concerns in this case, which relate to Miss White's behaviour and attitude. Furthermore, she has not meaningfully engaged with this process, and there has been no evidence that she would comply with conditions, even if they could be imposed. Accordingly, the Committee concluded that a conditions of practice order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

52. The Committee went on to consider whether to suspend Miss White's registration for a specified period. In doing so, it had regard to paragraph 277 of the Guidance which states that:

Suspension may be appropriate when all, or some, of the following factors are present:

- a. There is evidence of repetition of the behaviour.*
- b. The registrant has not shown insight into the issues which led to a finding of current impairment being made, and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour.*
- c. A lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest.*
- d. There is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems (which might make erasure the appropriate order).*

53. The Committee took account of the above factors, and had regard to the GDC's submissions. However, given its concerns regarding Miss White's insight into the allegations now found proved, particularly the serious findings in relation to the dishonesty, the Committee carefully considered whether a period of suspension would be sufficient in all the circumstances.

54. In reaching its decision, the Committee took account of paragraph 282 of the Guidance which deals with erasure. It identified the following factors as being relevant:

- The findings include serious departure(s) from the relevant professional standards.
- Where a continuing risk of serious harm to patients, colleagues, or other persons is identified.
- Where the findings include the abuse of a position of trust or violation of the rights of patients, colleagues, or other persons...
- Where the findings include serious dishonesty, particularly where persistent or covered up.
- Where there is a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of actions or their consequences.
- A lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest.

55. Whilst the Committee took into account Miss White's lack of meaningful engagement with the GDC and that in her limited emails to the Council, she has repeatedly stated that she wishes to be left alone and that she has no intention of returning to work in dentistry and wants to be removed from the register, this was not a deciding factor in the Committee's determination.

56. There has been no acknowledgement from Miss White in relation to the seriousness of her actions or their potential consequences, both in respect of her behaviour in acting outside of her scope of practice, and her dishonesty. The Committee determined that Miss White's misconduct demonstrated a blatant disregard for the GDC and the systems for regulating dental professionals.

57. Having taken all the matters in this case into account, it was the conclusion of the Committee that a period of suspension, even for the maximum period of 12 months, would not be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest. There was no evidence before the Committee to suggest that any period of suspension would result in any meaningful change in Miss White's position or level of insight.

58. The Committee determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction is erasure.

59. Unless Miss White exercises her right of appeal, her name will be erased from the Register for Dental Care Professionals, 28 days from the date that notice of this Committee's direction is deemed to have been served upon her.

Decision on an immediate order

60. In considering whether to impose an immediate order of suspension on Miss White's registration, the Committee took account of Mr Saad's application that such an order should be imposed. He submitted that the ongoing risk of repetition identified by the Committee means that an immediate order is necessary for the protection of the public and to uphold public confidence in the dental profession. Mr Saad referred the Committee to the relevant guidance to consider when making its decision.

61. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who drew its attention to the Guidance and outlined the statutory test for imposing immediate orders.

62. In the circumstances, the Committee determined that the imposition of an immediate order of suspension on Miss White's registration is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest.

63. In its substantive determination, the Committee has identified a risk of repetition, given the lack of any evidence of meaningful insight or remorse, and no evidence of any remediation from Miss White. In the circumstances, the Committee considered that it would be inconsistent not to impose an immediate order for the protection of the public. It took into account that in the absence of an immediate order, Miss White could, if she wished to do so, return to unrestricted practice during the appeal period, or for longer, in the event of an appeal.

64. The Committee was also satisfied that an immediate order is required in the wider public interest, in view of the gravity of the matters found proved. It considered that immediate action is necessary in this case to maintain public confidence in the dental profession and the regulatory process, and to uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

65. The effect of the foregoing substantive determination and this order is that Miss White's registration will be suspended to cover the appeal period. Unless she exercises her right of appeal, the substantive direction for erasure will take effect 28 days from the date of deemed service.
66. Should Miss White exercise her right of appeal, this immediate order will remain in place until the resolution of the appeal.
67. That concludes this determination.