

PUBLIC HEARING**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing****21st – 29 July 2026****Name:** KANTOPOULOS, George**Registration number:** 105577**Case number:** CAS-210710-B4M4L9

General Dental Council: Mr Christopher Saad, counsel.
Instructed by Saba Khan, IHLPS**Registrant:** Present
Represented by Mr Scott Ivill, counsel.
Instructed by Jack Waller, MDU

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct**Outcome:** Suspended with immediate suspension (with a review)**Duration:** 12 months**Immediate order:** Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Charlotte Carling (Dental Care Professional Member, Chair)
Phillip Loughnane (Dentist member)
Aleena Choudhry (Lay member)**Legal adviser:** Barrie Searle (21 – 27 July 2026)
Trevor Jones (28-29 July 2026)**Committee Secretary:** Sarah Crewe

That being registered as a dentist you:

1. Whilst employed as a dentist at the Practice you accessed pornographic material on a practice computer on two separate occasions.
2. Your conduct at allegation 1 was:
 - (i) Unprofessional; and/or
 - (ii) Sexual harassment.
3. You failed to treat Witness 1 with respect, by saying to her 'Once you start making babies you won't want to stop'.
4. Your conduct at allegation 3 was unprofessional.
5. WITHDRAWN
6. WITHDRAWN
7. You failed to treat Witness 3 with respect by trapping her by a sink, and not adhering to her requests to move out of her way.
8. Your conduct at allegation 7 was:
 - (i) Unprofessional; and/or (ii) Sexual harassment; and/or (iii) Sexually motivated.
9. You failed to treat Witness 4 with respect by:
 - (i) Questioning her about her sexuality; and/or
 - (ii) Questioning if she was in a lesbian relationship with another colleague; and/or
 - (iii) Told her to sit in the corner until you were ready to see the next patient; and/or
 - (iv) Telling her that she should fly to Greece with you; and/or
 - (v) Saying to her "my son likes pretty dental nurses and doesn't like ones that aren't" or words to this effect; and/or
 - (vi) Asking her to stay in the Practice after closing to do paperwork with you when this was not her responsibility.
10. Your conduct at allegation 9 (i) and/or 9 (ii) and /or 9 (iii) and/or 9 (iv) and/or 9 (v) and/or 9 (vi) was:
 - (i) Unprofessional; and/or (ii) Sexual harassment; and/or (iii) Sexually motivated.
11. You failed to treat Witness 5 with respect by:
 - (i) Standing and/or leaning over her; and/or
 - (ii) Sitting very close to her so that your arms would be touching her; and/or (iii) Moving closer to her when she would move away.

12. Your conduct at allegation 11 (i) and/or 11 (ii) and/or 11 (iii) was:

- (i) Unprofessional; and/or (ii) Sexual harassment' and/or (iii) Sexually motivated.

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

Mr Kantopoulos,

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing in respect of a case brought against you by the General Dental Council (GDC).
2. The hearing is being conducted remotely via TEAMS.
3. You are represented at these proceedings by Mr Scott Ivill, Counsel. The Case Presenter for the GDC is Mr Christopher Saad, Counsel.

Decision and Reasons on application under Rule 57 (21 July 2026):

4. The Committee heard an application made by Mr Saad, on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC) that it receives the written statements of Witness 2 in evidence. This application was made under the provisions of Rule 57 which states:

57. (1) A Practice Committee may in the course of the proceedings receive oral, documentary or other evidence that is admissible in civil proceedings in the appropriate court in that part of the United Kingdom in which the hearing takes place.

(2) A Practice Committee may also, at their discretion, treat other evidence as admissible if, after consultation with the legal adviser, they consider that it would be helpful to the Practice Committee, and in the interests of justice, for that evidence to be heard.

5. Mr Saad outlined the basis for his application and the factors that the Committee must consider in reaching its decision. He referred the Committee to his skeleton argument and detailed the background to the case. Mr Saad informed the Committee that one of the witnesses in the internal investigation was Witness 2. Witness 2 is a dental nurse, who worked with you at the practice. Mr Saad outlined the concerns raised by Witness 2, which are particularised in the charges.
6. Mr Saad referred the Committee to the charges and the admissions that you have indicated you will be making, and the parts of the charges that you deny. He also referred the Committee to the caveats to your admissions, including that you admit some actions and conversations, but deny the alleged motivations for these. Other charges you deny outright. He submitted that the admissions you have indicated you will be making support the application to allow the witness statement of Witness 2 into evidence.
7. Mr Saad informed the Committee that Witness 2 has health concerns that have been exacerbated by the stress of attending a hearing to discuss her account of events. Witness 2 was asked to provide medical evidence in support of this application, which Mr Saad referred the Committee to.
8. In his written submissions Mr Saad stated:

Witness 2's [statement] is admissible in these proceedings. The threshold for admissibility contained within Rule 57 of the General Dental Council Fitness to Practise Rules (the Rules) are plainly met.

Furthermore as the grounds relied on concern health, this evidence would be admissible in criminal proceedings pursuant to section 116 of the Criminal Justice Act 2003. The criminal jurisdiction has much more stringent rules surrounding the admissibility of evidence than the regulatory jurisdiction. As such, Witness 2's evidence is plainly admissible in regulatory proceedings.

9. Mr Saad referred the Committee to the case of Thorneycroft v Nursing and Midwifery Council [2014] EWHC 1565 (Admin) and submitted that there is no evidence that Witness 2 had fabricated her account of events. On the contrary a lot of what she has said is positive towards you, and you have also admitted to some of the alleged behaviour and comments. Further, there is medical evidence to support the reasons for her non-attendance.
10. Mr Ivill, on your behalf, informed the Committee that the application is opposed. He referred the Committee to his skeleton argument, which included reference to the case of Ogbonna v Nursing and Midwifery Council [2010] EWCA Civ 1216 which stated:

"in the absence of a problem in the witness giving evidence in person or by video link, or some other exceptional circumstance, fairness requires that in disciplinary proceedings a person facing serious charges, especially if they amount to criminal offences which if proved are likely to have grave adverse effects on his or her reputation and career, should in principle be entitled by cross-examination to test the evidence of his accuser(s) where that evidence is the sole or decisive evidence relied on against him."
11. Mr Ivill submitted that allowing the statement of Witness 2 into evidence would be inherently unfair to you. He outlined the opposition to the application and referred the Committee to specific paragraphs of his written submissions. In particular there appears to have been no attempt made to ascertain whether any special measures could be put in place to allow Witness 2 to give evidence, and the medical note does not go so far as to say that Witness 2 is unfit to give evidence.
12. Mr Ivill informed the Committee that Witness 2 was made aware when she gave her statement in 2025 that she may be required to attend a hearing to give evidence, and she was subsequently informed of the dates that this hearing was listed to take place. He also referred the Committee to correspondence wherein Witness 2 was asked if she would be willing to attend a hearing in London, she indicated that she was. Witness 2 was also asked if she required any special measures, to which she responded that if in person she would request to give evidence from behind a screen. Mr Ivill submitted that this is inconsistent with Witness 2's latest correspondence wherein she stated that she was not aware that she may be required to attend a hearing to give evidence.
13. Mr Ivill submitted that Witness 2's evidence is key to the most serious of the charges that you face. Admitting her statement without cross examination would prejudice the fairness of these proceedings. In this regard Mr Ivill referred the Committee to the case of Thorneycroft and submitted that Witness 2's evidence is the sole evidence in relation to some of the charges.

The Committee's decision on the hearsay application

14. The Committee considered the evidence provided to it. It took account of the submissions made, both orally and in writing. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser regarding its discretion to admit hearsay evidence under Rule 57, the important principles to be drawn from the

case law brought to its attention and from the GDC's '*Guidance for the practice committees (effective from 6 January 2026)*' ('the Guidance').

15. The Committee noted from the Rules and the Guidance that it had a discretion to admit hearsay evidence if it considered it would be helpful and in the interests of justice. It also took into account that the issues of 'relevance' and 'fairness' should be key considerations in its decision-making. The Committee further bore in mind the overarching statutory objective of the GDC.
16. The Committee considered the factors set out in the case of Thorneycroft, as drawn to its attention by both parties, alongside the relevant factors of Rule 57. It reached the following conclusions:

Whether there is a good reason for the non-attendance of Witness 2

17. The Committee did consider there to be a good reason for Witness 2's non-attendance at this hearing. It noted that she had obtained a letter from her general practitioner, who clearly outlined that her health was preventing her from undertaking her 'professional obligations'. Further, these matters have had a direct impact on her health and the stress of giving evidence would exacerbate her condition and put her at risk, given her history which included being hospitalised.
18. The Committee noted that Witness 2 had indicated that she would be happy to attend a hearing when she gave her initial statement. While she has now said that she was unaware that she would have to attend to give evidence, the Committee did not consider that this was in any way evidence that she was trying to avoid the issue.

Whether the evidence of Patient Witness 2 was the sole or decisive evidence in support of charges 5(i) and 5(iii)

19. It was agreed by both parties that Witness 2 was the sole witness to the alleged conduct in charges 5(i) and 5(iii). Whilst the Committee noted the submission made by Mr Saad that it could take into account the evidence of other witnesses as evidence of propensity to support these charges in the absence of Witness 2, it was not satisfied, having considered the limited material before it, that the evidence of witnesses in relation to separate matters is relevant to these specific charges. The absence of this witness means that the evidence cannot be tested, which would result in unanswered questions that the Committee may have, leading to an inherent unfairness to you.

The nature and extent of the challenge to the contents of the statement

20. The Committee considered the nature and extent of the challenge to the content of the statement of Witness 2 to be significant. While the Committee has not had sight of the statement, it was clear from the submissions that the objection made on your behalf to the hearsay evidence was robust.

Whether there is any suggestion that Witness 2 had reasons to fabricate her complaint

21. The Committee noted that there was no suggestion that Witness 2 had fabricated her evidence. It had been made aware that Witness 2 had also made positive statements about working with you, which demonstrated that she was not intentionally providing false or misleading evidence.

The seriousness of the charge, taking into account the impact which adverse findings might have on your career

22. The allegations in question are very serious, including alleged sexual misconduct. The Committee bore in mind the potential consequences for your registration should the charges be found proved.

Whether the GDC has taken reasonable steps to secure Witness 2's attendance

23. The Committee was satisfied that the GDC had taken reasonable steps to secure Witness 2's attendance at this hearing. Witness 2 had initially indicated that she would be willing to attend, including an in person hearing. Further, she had indicated a request for screens if the hearing were to take place in person. The Committee also had sight of the correspondence between the GDC and Witness 2 in the lead up to the hearing and noted the steps taken by the GDC to secure her attendance. The Committee concluded that the GDC had taken reasonable steps.

Whether you had prior notice that the statement would be relied upon by the GDC

24. The Committee took into account that your objection to the admission of the hearsay evidence is not based on whether you had sufficient notice of the GDC's reliance on the statement of Witness 2, but rather the fundamental unfairness of the application itself.

Decision

25. Having considered all the above factors, the Committee concluded that the statement of Witness 2 may be relevant, but it would be fundamentally unfair and contrary to the interests of justice to admit it into evidence. While the Committee accepted that there was a good reason for the non attendance of Witness 2, the unfairness to you outweighs this.
26. The Committee noted the submission by Mr Saad regarding the Criminal Justice Act 2003, however it concluded that the factors set out in the case of Thorneycroft and the GDC Guidance was sufficient for it to reach its conclusion on these matters.
27. The Committee bore in mind that cross-examination is not an unfettered right, but it considered that it would be unfair for the untested evidence to be admitted, given the gravity of the allegations concerned.
28. The Committee therefore determined to reject the GDC's application to admit Witness 2's statement as hearsay evidence.

Decision and reasons on application to amend charge (22 July 2026):

29. The Committee heard an application made by Mr Saad, on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC), under rule 18, to amend the charges.
30. Mr Saad informed the Committee that he was seeking to withdraw charges 5 and 6 following the Committee's decision not to admit Witness 2's evidence.
31. Mr Ivill informed the Committee that he agreed to the withdrawal of charges.
32. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
33. The Committee considered the application to withdraw charges and the reasoning provided by the GDC for this application. It was satisfied that given it is the GDC who brings this case against you, and in circumstances where the GDC does not seek to pursue these charges, it would be entirely appropriate and fair to allow the application to withdraw the charges outlined by Mr Saad.
34. Given the above, the Committee accedes to the application made by Mr Saad on behalf of the GDC.

Case background

35. On 17 May 2024 the GDC received a referral in relation to your alleged conduct. It is alleged that on the evening of 29 April 2024 you worked late at the practice on your own to complete notes. It is said that on the following morning, members of the nursing team saw on your computer google search history a search for a pornographic website and a number of videos with explicit titles.
36. The Practice had carried out its own investigation, during which further allegations came to light about your inappropriate comments and behaviour towards members of the nursing team.

Evidence

37. The evidence received by the Committee included oral evidence from five witnesses for the GDC along with witness statements and associated exhibits provided from those witnesses along with a sixth witness whose evidence was agreed. It also heard oral evidence from you.
38. The documentary evidence before the Committee included, but was not limited to, the following:
 - Photographs of the computer search history
 - Photographs of the surgery room
 - Statements from six witnesses and associated exhibits
 - Your witness statement
 - Character references

The Committee's findings of fact (27 July 2026)

39. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It considered the charges separately. The Committee also bore 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.
40. The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee of Warby J's judgement in the case of Dutta v GMC [2020] EWHC 1974 (Admin) and his reliance on the judgement in Gestmin SGPS SA v Credit Suisse (UK) Ltd [2013] EWHC 3650 (Comm), set out at paragraph 39 as follows:

The best approach from a judge is to base factual findings on inferences drawn from documentary evidence and known or probable facts. "This does not mean that oral testimony serves no useful purpose... But its value lies largely... in the opportunity which cross examination affords to subject the documentary record to critical scrutiny and to gauge the personality, motivations and working practices of a witness, rather than in testimony of what the witness recalls of particular conversations and events. Above all, it is important to avoid the fallacy of supposing that, because a witness has confidence in his or her recollection and is honest, evidence based on that recollection provides any reliable guide to the truth".

41. The Committee has adopted the reasoning in Dutta when it considered the contemporaneous documents in this case.
42. The Committee also bore in mind and accepted the good character direction from the Legal Adviser. The Committee considered evidence relating to your character and professional conduct prior to the allegations. The Committee recognised that evidence of good character and a history of regulatory compliance is a relevant factor in determining whether you are likely to have acted in the way alleged. However, the Committee noted that whilst good character is relevant, it is not a defence to the charges. The Committee took the view that if you have demonstrated consistent compliance with professional standards over a 19 years, this would make it less probable that you would have departed from that standard of conduct on the occasion in question. Nevertheless, the Committee was clear that any assessment of character must be considered alongside the factual evidence before it. The Committee could not place reliance on character evidence alone, and any findings must be based on the substantive facts and evidence adduced during the hearing.
43. The Committee factual findings are as follows:

1.	<i>Whilst employed as a dentist at the Practice you accessed pornographic material on a practice computer on two separate occasions.</i> Admitted and Found Proved.
2.	<i>Your conduct at allegation 1 was</i> Your conduct in relation to 1) was:
2.(i)	<i>Unprofessional; and/or</i> Admitted and Found Proved.
2.(ii)	<i>Sexual harassment.</i>

	Found Proved. The Committee first of all reminded itself of your admission in relation to charge 1 and the definition of sexual harassment that was provided by the Legal Adviser and agreed by both parties. You told the Committee you were alone in the practice and the viewing of the pornographic material was outside of work hours and therefore, while you admit it was unprofessional you deny that it constituted sexual harassment. Witness 4, in her evidence, told the Committee that she found the search term 'youporn' when she went to the google search to look for the radio station to listen to. She told the Committee that this was not the first time this had happened, but previously she had not had any documentary proof of it, so this time she took photos of the google search term. Witness 4 explained that she then went into the browser history and found that you had viewed multiple videos, starting at 6:38pm. The Committee was aware that the practice closed at 6:30. Witness 4 again took a photo of the browser history. The Committee considered the definition provided by the Legal Adviser for sexual harassment as: <i>'Sexual harassment' means therefore unwanted sexual conduct that has the purpose of or the effect violating a person's dignity or creates a hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.</i> The panel considered the question of good character but determined that it was not relevant to the question of sexual harassment given the objective nature of the test. The Committee concluded that finding the search history in google and then subsequently in the browser history would have had the effect of violating Witness 4's dignity and creating a hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment. Witness 4 told the Committee that it was horrible, and Witness 5 said that she was horrified. Accordingly, the Committee concluded that charge 2(b) is found proved.
3.	<i>You failed to treat Witness 1 with respect, by saying to her 'Once you start making babies you won't want to stop'.</i> Found Not Proved. Witness 1 told the Committee that this incident took place during a conversation about children. She explained that she did not complain about it at the time as she didn't think anything of it, beyond she was offended and left the room. However, she told the Committee that she was not overly concerned. You explained that you did not mean any offence by this statement, you were trying to say that, from personal experience, once you have a child you will want

	more. You explained that you meant ‘having babies’ rather than ‘making babies’. You told the Committee that, as English is not your first language, the wording you used may have been clumsy due to a mistranslation. The Committee accepted your explanation that there was a misinterpretation of what you were saying due to a mistranslation from your native Greek to English. The Committee considered that while it was a clumsy thing to say, this did not amount to a failure to treat Witness 1 with respect. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved.
4.	<i>Your conduct at allegation 3 was unprofessional</i> Found Not Proved. Given the Committee’s finding at charge 3, this charge falls away.
5.	<i>WITHDRAWN</i>
6.	<i>WITHDRAWN</i>
7.	<i>You failed to treat Witness 3 with respect by trapping her by a sink, and not adhering to her requests to move out of her way.</i> Found Not Proved The Committee had sight of the photographs of the surgery, however these were provided after Witness 3 gave evidence and so the Committee did not have the opportunity to ask her questions about the specific positions that you and Witness 3 were in when this incident occurred. Witness 3 started her evidence by explaining that she did not initially recall this incident until the notes from that day were shown to her. She explained that she didn’t feel threatened by the situation and thought it was insignificant as she thought you were just joking. Witness 3 told the Committee that she had a good working relationship with you and had no real complaints, she continued to work with you for a number of years and considered you to be on good terms. Witness 3 told the Committee that you were standing over her when she was by the sink and she asked you to move multiple times and you did not. She explained that she told you that if you didn’t move out of the way she would call her colleague for help. You still did not move, so Witness 3 called out to her colleague who came into the room, however she did not recall telling her colleague that you had trapped her. In response to questions Witness 3 explained that she could have left the room by going in the other direction, however she explained that she believed that you would move with her and block that way as well. In response to questions Witness 3 accepted that her response may have been the result of a ‘bad mood’ that day as suggested by you in your evidence. You told the Committee that you accepted that you did not move when Witness 3 asked you to. You explained that you did not realise she was being serious, and while you accept that you should have moved, you did not accept that this

	amounted to a lack of respect. Given the evidence from Witness 3 and from you, the Committee considered that there was insufficient evidence to find that witness 3 was trapped by you. Further, based on the fact that Witness 3 thought you were joking and did not consider it to be a significant incident and did not remember it, the Committee did not conclude that your actions amounted to a lack of respect. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved.
8.	<i>Your conduct at allegation 7 was:</i> <i>(i) Unprofessional; and/or</i> <i>(ii) Sexual harassment; and/or</i> <i>(iii) Sexually motivated.</i> Found Not Proved Given the finding that charge 7 was not proved, this charge is also not proved.
9.	<i>You failed to treat Witness 4 with respect by:</i>
(i)	<i>Questioning her about her sexuality; and/or</i> Found Proved The Committee had sight of the internal interview notes from 30 April 2024. In this it is noted that Witness 4 said that you had asked her if she had a boyfriend, and when she said no you asked her if she liked girls. Witness 4 expanded on this during her oral evidence explaining that she told you that she hadn't found the right man yet and you responded that maybe she liked girls. She described this as 'sleazy' in that you made a comment under your breath and it made her uncomfortable. She told the Committee that when a female colleague came into the room you gestured towards her and insinuated that maybe they would be a good option for a relationship. Witness 4 told the Committee that the internal interview was 'a bit of a shock', and her focus was on the more serious matters. She explained that this incident was mentioned at that time as an example of other matters, but she said there were more important things she was focussed on during that interview. You explained that you did ask Witness 4 this, but it was a joke. You explained that you and Witness 4 did not get along most of the time, but you did not intend to offend her. You explained that since having done professional boundaries training you understand that this was unprofessional, but you deny that it was not respectful. While the Committee noted that this incident was not elaborated on in the contemporaneous note of 30 April 2026, Witness 4 explained that she was focussed on the more important issues at that time. The Committee considered that while the note was not elaborated on, it does support Witness 4's oral

	evidence. Her oral evidence was more detailed, but the Committee considered that this did not diminish the contemporaneous note, the additional detail given was in direct response to questions during her oral evidence. Further, you did not disagree that this incident occurred, you only disagreed with the context of the incident. The Committee considered that asking someone about their sexuality in a professional environment, regardless of their sexual orientation, is not a respectful thing to do as a registered professional. This is particularly so considering you have accepted that you and Witness 4 were not on good terms, so this would not have been a shared joke, but a joke at Witness 4's expense, which is disrespectful. Accordingly, this charge is found proved.
(ii)	<i>Questioning if she was in a lesbian relationship with another colleague; and/or</i> Found Proved Witness 4 told the Committee that after you had asked her if she liked girls another female colleague, Witness 2, entered the room and you gestured to Witness 2 and inferred that she could be a partner for Witness 4. You explained that you found this 'sleazy' as you laughed and made a comment under your breath. Witness 4 accepted that you had not used the word lesbian, however this was implied given both you and Witness 2 are women. You explained that you did gesture to Witness 2, but that you meant it in a way that she was also single and may be in a similar position to Witness 4. You stated that you did not intend offence and you were making a joke, although you accept that she did not find this funny. You explained that your door was open during this conversation and you disagreed that there was a power imbalance between you and Witness 4. The Committee considered all the evidence before it and determined that you did question whether Witness 4 was in a relationship with a female colleague, inferring she was in a lesbian relationship. Given the findings at (i) the Committee concluded that making this 'joke' was not respectful of Witness 4. Accordingly, this charge is found proved
(iii)	<i>Told her to sit in the corner until you were ready to see the next patient; and/or</i> Found Not Proved The Committee noted Witness 4's evidence that you told her to sit in the corner until you were ready for the next patient. This was also mentioned in the contemporaneous record of the internal interview and in Witness 4's witness statement prepared for this hearing. Witness 4 described your tone as dismissive. Having seen the photographs of the surgery, the seat was in the corner and the room itself is very small. However, the Committee accepted your evidence that Witness 4 had asked multiple times if she should bring the next patient in and in your frustration you simply asked her to take a seat while you completed your

	notes. It accepted that this was a clumsy way of you asking her to be patient until you were ready. The Committee did not consider you asking Witness 4 to take a seat until you were ready to be demonstrative of a lack of respect. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved.
(iv)	<i>Telling her that she should fly to Greece with you; and/or</i> Found Not Proved Witness 4 explained to the Committee that you invited her to visit Greece with you. When asked she explained that it was not a general ‘you should visit Greece’ conversation as she had been to Greece before. You explained that you made a general statement that Witness 4 should visit Greece, not that you were inviting her to go to Greece with you. You explained that the discussion was about the Greek Islands as Witness 4 had expressed a desire to visit, but you were clear that there was no invitation and you live on the mainland. You stated that it was not true that you told Witness 4 that your wife would like it if Witness 4 came to visit him in Greece. The Committee considered, based on the balance of probabilities, that it was more than likely that Witness 4 misunderstood the conversation. It was agreed by both Witness 4 and yourself that you did not get along, and so the Committee did not consider it likely that you would have invited her to visit you in Greece. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved.
(v)	<i>Saying to her “my son likes pretty dental nurses and doesn’t like ones that aren’t” or words to this effect; and/or</i> Found Not Proved You told the Committee that you were talking about your son not wanting to go to nursery, but that he was more compliant when there was a ‘pretty nursery worker’ there. You stated that your son had not been to the dentist before and therefore wouldn’t have a view on dental nurses. Witness 4 was adamant that this conversation took place and was about dental nurses and not nursery workers. Given the information before it, and having heard your oral evidence, the Committee considered that it was more likely than not that this was a miscommunication. It took into account that English is not your first language, and that when you were explaining your account of the conversation it appeared to the Committee that you were saying nurses, when in fact you were saying nursery.

	Further, there was no mention in internal investigation notes about this incident. The Committee finds that, on the balance of probabilities, you did not say that your son ‘likes pretty nurses and doesn’t like the ones that aren’t’. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved.
(vi)	<i>Asking her to stay in the Practice after closing to do paperwork with you when this was not her responsibility.</i> Found Proved It was explained by Witness 4 that she was not trained to do paperwork at this time and that you asking her to stay behind to do paperwork was said to make her uncomfortable. You admitted in evidence that you did do this but that you were making a joke about it. The Committee considered all the evidence in relation to this exchange. It considered that you knew that Witness 4 was not trained to do paperwork and given that this conversation took place in front of other colleagues, it was clearly a joke at Witness 4’s expense. The Committee concluded that asking Witness 4 to stay after closing to do paperwork with you did demonstrate a lack of respect. Accordingly, this charge is found proved.
10.	<i>Your conduct at allegation 9 (i) and/or 9 (ii) and /or 9 (iii) and/or 9 (iv) and/or 9 (v) and/or 9 (vi) was:</i>
(i)	<i>Unprofessional; and/or</i> Fount Proved in relation to 9(i), 9(ii) and 9(vi). You told the Committee that you accepted that asking Witness 4 about whether she had a boyfriend, or if she liked girls, was unprofessional, you also accepted that inferring that Witness 4 was in a same sex relationship with another colleague was also unprofessional. You explained that people at the practice discussed personal topics, however you have since undertaken courses in professional boundaries and you recognise that your behaviour was unprofessional. Witness 4 told the Committee that she had tried to shut down the conversation, but when Witness 2 entered the room you continued by gesturing towards her and insinuating that Witness 4 and Witness 2 could be in a relationship together. The evidence before the Committee was that you initiated the discussion and you continued your questioning even when Witness 4 tried to shut you down. The Committee has already determined that you were in a position of authority and that this was a joke made at Witness 4’s expense. The Committee considered that this was unprofessional behaviour in the workplace.

	The Committee considered whether your conduct in asking Witness 4 to stay after hours with you to complete paperwork was unprofessional. The Committee has already determined that you asked this in front of other colleagues, knowing that she was not trained to do paperwork at that time, to make Witness 4 the subject of the joke. You accepted that you said this as a 'joke' because you knew that she would not stay after hours, and not because you were trying to assist her. The Committee considered that the way you did this was unprofessional. Accordingly, the Committee finds this charge proved in respect of charges 9(i), 9(ii) and 9(vi).
(ii)	<i>Sexual harassment; and/or</i> Fount Proved in relation to 9(i) and 9(ii) Found Not Proved in relation to 9(vi). The panel considered the question of good character but determined that it was not relevant to the question of sexual harassment given the objective nature of the test. The Committee next considered whether asking Witness 4 questions about whether she had a boyfriend was sexual harassment and if questioning whether Witness 4 was in a same sex relationship with a colleague was sexual harassment. The Committee previously concluded that, given Witness 4 had tried to shut down the discussion, the 'joke' was about Witness 4's sexuality and questioning whether she was in a lesbian relationship. Witness 4 was a junior colleague. The Committee reminded itself of the legal advice that sexual harassment means unwanted sexual conduct that has the purpose of, or the effect of violating a person's dignity, creating a hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment. The Committee concluded that these 'jokes', in all the circumstances, did have the effect on Witness 4 as outlined above, and therefore amounted to sexual harassment. The Committee reminded itself that whatever your intent was with the 'jokes', is irrelevant for the purpose of determining sexual harassment. Accordingly, this charge is found proved in relation to 9(i) and 9(ii). The Committee next considered whether asking Witness 4 to stay after work to do paperwork amounted to sexual harassment. There is no suggestion that this was in any way relating to anyone's sexuality or mention of anything of a sexual nature. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved in relation to charge 9(vi).
(iii)	<i>Sexually motivated.</i> Found Not Proved in its entirety Witness 4 did not say in her evidence that she believed that your behaviour was motivated by the want of a sexual relationship, her only comment was that she

	found it 'sleazy'. You also denied any sexual intent towards Witness 4 and were adamant that none of these 'jokes' were about pursuing a sexual relationship or for sexual gratification. In looking at your evidence in respect of these charges the Committee had regard to your good character. It accepted your evidence in relation to this charge and concluded that it is less likely that you would have behaved in the way that is alleged. The Committee considered that, based on everything that has been presented to it, that your conduct in making a joke about Witness 4's sexuality and questioning if she was in a 'lesbian' relationship, was not sexually motivated. The Committee next considered whether asking Witness 4 to stay after work to do paperwork was sexually motivated. There is no suggestion that this was in any way relating to anything of a sexual nature. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved.
11.	<i>You failed to treat Witness 5 with respect by:</i> <i>(i) Standing and/or leaning over her; and/or</i> <i>(ii) Sitting very close to her so that your arms would be touching her; and/or</i> <i>(iii) Moving closer to her when she would move away.</i> Found Not Proved in its entirety Witness 5 gave oral evidence to the Committee and in her evidence she was able to clearly recall when and where this occurred. The Committee noted that this was referred to in the internal investigation note, but no detail was given, simply that Witness 5 said 'he sits too close'. It was also stated by Witness 5 that this behaviour took place in the reception area and not in the surgery. In response to questioning Witness 5 told the Committee that you stood behind her with your arms boxing her in and your hands on the desk on either side of her. She also stated that you put your hand on her shoulder. Witness 5 was adamant that while the practice may not be a big space there is no need to stand so close that skin is touching and she has not experienced this with any other colleague. In response to questions Witness 5 clarified, when shown the photograph of the surgery, that this took place in the reception area and not in the surgery. She also accepted that she had not raised this with you before. You told the Committee that you spent 95% of your time in your surgery and you have no recollection of ever touching Witness 5. This was also in your written statement, dated 21 May 2026. You explained that you have no recollection but that you did not treat Witness 5 any differently than any other of the dental nurses. You explained that if this did happen it would have been unintentional while you were both looking at the computer screen. Witness 5 did not elaborate on the allegation that you would move closer if she moved away, and this is not mentioned in the contemporaneous note of the internal investigation. Having seen the photograph of your surgery the Committee considered that this

	was a small space and it would not be unusual for you to be working in close proximity with your dental nurses. You accepted that this kind of thing happened in general in the surgery, but that you did not accept that you stood over Witness 5 or that you would move closer when she moved away. Given the close proximity when working together, the Committee concluded that, even if you had stood over Witness 5 or sat close to her when looking at the computer this did not amount to you failing to treat Witness 5 with respect. The Committee concluded that the GDC has failed to discharge its burden in proving the facts as alleged and the only proper finding based on the evidence is that this charge is not proved
12.	<i>Your conduct at allegation 11 (i) and/or 11 (ii) and/or 11 (iii) was:</i> <i>(i) Unprofessional; and/or</i> <i>(ii) Sexual harassment' and/or</i> <i>(iii) Sexually motivated.</i> Found Not Proved in its entirety Given the Committee found charge 11 not proved in its entirety this charge falls away.

Decision and reasons on fitness to practise (29 July 2026)

44. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee next moved forward to consider three matters: whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct; if so, whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of that misconduct; and, should impairment be found, what sanction, if any, to impose.
45. In accordance with Rule 20 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2006, the Committee heard submissions from Mr Saad on behalf of the GDC and from Mr Ivill on your behalf in relation to the matters of misconduct, impairment and sanction.

Submissions

46. Mr Saad addressed the Committee on misconduct, impairment, and sanction, referring to specific paragraphs in the guidance. He noted a previous 2008 GDC Investigating Committee finding regarding website advertising but submitted this was not strictly relevant to the present case.
47. On misconduct, Mr Saad reminded the Committee there is no burden or standard of proof—it is a matter for the Committee's judgment. He invited the Committee to find that your actions breached the Standards and amounted to serious professional misconduct, referring to the Guidance for Practice Committees (2026).
48. On impairment, Mr Saad submitted the question must be considered in current terms, not historically. He highlighted factors including insight, remorse, remediation and risk of repetition. He submitted you demonstrated limited insight, particularly regarding the power imbalance between yourself and the witnesses, noting you stated you were the one without power.
49. Mr Saad submitted that a finding of current impairment is required to uphold professional standards and maintain public confidence. The sexual misconduct demonstrates an attitudinal

issue, and the public has a fundamental right to trust that dental professionals do not sexually harass their colleagues.

50. On sanction, Mr Saad outlined aggravating and mitigating factors and noted that while erasure may be considered in sexual harassment cases, it is not automatic. He submitted the appropriate and proportionate sanction would be a 12-month suspension with review, allowing you time to demonstrate full understanding and meaningful behavioural change while sending a clear message to the public and profession.
51. Mr Ivill informed the Committee that you accept there was a falling short of standards and therefore focused his submissions on current impairment. He submitted that the absence of repetition evidences that the misconduct is remediable and has been remediated. The time elapsed without further complaints shows insight, reflection and remediation. You have made a full apology and fully engaged with the GDC throughout.
52. Mr Ivill submitted there is no suggestion you are a risk to the public, and the FtP process itself is sufficient to address the public interest. He asked the Committee to consider that English is not your first language when evaluating your evidence.
53. Mr Ivill submitted it is entirely open to the Committee to make no finding of impairment, referring to GMC v Shah [2025] EWHC 899, which made clear that even in sexual harassment cases the Committee must consider context and circumstances, and there is a spectrum of seriousness.
54. Mr Ivill characterised the pornography charges as occurring out of hours with no colleagues present, submitting you did not intend for colleagues to discover the material. He characterized the comments to Witness 4 as ill-judged jokes without intent to demean, representing isolated remarks at the lower end of the spectrum. He referred to testimonials from colleagues who had worked with you for some time without issues, and noted Witness 5 herself said she worked well with you.
55. Mr Ivill submitted that if the Committee reached the stage of sanction, the proportionate outcome is a reprimand. He submitted there are no present attitudinal issues requiring suspension, no evidence of repetition, and testimonials demonstrating your character. Any suspension would be punitive.
56. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Misconduct

57. The Committee acknowledged that misconduct was defined in *Roylance (No. 2) v General Medical Council* [2000] AC 311 as "a word of general effect, involving some act or omission, which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances with the standard of propriety often being found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed by a [registrant] in the particular circumstances."
58. The Committee noted you accept the facts found proved amount to misconduct, however it exercised its own judgement in reaching this decision.
59. The Committee considered the following principles from the Standards:

Standard 6.1

You must work effectively with your colleagues and contribute to good teamwork

6.1.2 *You must treat colleagues fairly and with respect, in all situations and all forms of interaction and communication. You must not bully, harass, or unfairly discriminate against them.*

Standard 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

9.1.1 *You must treat all team members, other colleagues and members of the public fairly, with dignity and in line with the law.*

60. The Committee took into account that a breach of the relevant Standards does not automatically result in a finding of misconduct. However, it considered that accessing pornography on a work computer within work premises; making disrespectful, unprofessional comments to dental nurses; and engaging in sexual harassment is serious and would be considered deplorable by fellow professionals.
61. The Committee also had regard to paragraph 213 of the Guidance, which states that misconduct includes conduct of a disreputable, morally culpable, or otherwise disgraceful kind which may occur outside professional practice but which brings disgrace upon the registrant and undermines confidence in the professions, and that it does not matter whether such conduct is directly related to the exercise of professional skills.
62. Therefore, the Committee determined that your conduct was a sufficiently serious departure from the Standards to amount to misconduct.

Impairment

63. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that it must assess current impairment of fitness to practise. It is not sufficient to find that your fitness to practise was impaired at the time the matters took place; rather, it must be found that your fitness to practise is impaired as of today.
64. The Committee therefore considered whether your conduct was likely to be repeated in the future; whether your misconduct is remediable; whether it had been remedied; and whether there is a risk of repetition. It had regard to the guidance which states that sexual misconduct by dental professionals has the potential to seriously undermine public confidence and that cases relating to sexual misconduct are inherently serious, and where there has been a fundamental breach of professional standards, efforts to remediate might be afforded less weight.
65. The Committee considered that the misconduct in this case is capable of remediation, although it recognised that behavioural misconduct is more difficult to remediate than clinical misconduct.
66. The Committee considered what actions you have taken since the concerns came to light. It had regard to Mr Ivill's submissions and the documentation you provided. It considered that you have demonstrated some limited understanding of your behaviour and the findings, but this is in the early stages and the Committee was not satisfied by the written reflection you provided. There was no written reflection accompanying the CPD certificates of the courses you have undertaken or what learning you gained from them, nor any documentary evidence as to how you have embedded any learning into your current practice.
67. The Committee noted you have acknowledged your behaviour following the findings of fact and offered an apology and expression of remorse. However, it concluded that without proper understanding and evidence of genuinely embedded behaviour these carry less weight. You did not provide any evidence or clear explanation of what steps you have taken to address your conduct beyond attending professional boundaries courses, contemporaneous written reflection on these courses detailing what you learned, what you now understand about your behaviour, and how you would ensure it does not happen again.
68. While the Committee could not be satisfied that the risk of repetition was highly unlikely.
69. Sexual harassment is a very serious matter, and while your actions may be considered at the lower end of the spectrum of sexual harassment, it does not lessen the overall severity of the

misconduct. Further, you have not addressed the Committee, beyond an acceptance that it was inappropriate, on your accessing pornography on your work computer on work premises within minutes of the practice closing. There is very little in your reflection to demonstrate that you understand why this was inappropriate, and you maintain your position that it was out of working hours when nobody was present.

70. The Committee concluded that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.
71. In its consideration of the wider public interest, the Committee had regard to the test established in *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin) (the "Grant test"). This test requires the Committee to consider whether an informed member of the public, with knowledge of the regulatory objectives and the full circumstances of the case, would regard a finding of impairment as necessary to uphold those regulatory objectives.
72. The GDC's overarching regulatory objectives are threefold: to protect the public; to maintain and promote proper professional standards and conduct; and to maintain public confidence in the dental professions and the upholding of proper standards and conduct.
73. In applying the Grant test, the Committee considered what an informed member of the public would know: that you engaged in sexual harassment of a colleague through unwanted sexual comments and behaviour; that you accessed pornography on your work computer within minutes of the practice closing; that there was an imbalance of power between you and the affected colleague; that your conduct caused actual harm; and that your insight remains incomplete with no substantive evidence of embedded behavioural change.
74. Such a person would be disturbed to learn that a registered dental professional accessed pornography on his work computer only 8 minutes after the practice closed. Such a person would be troubled that colleagues were subjected to sexual harassment and placed at unwarranted risk of harm in their workplace; that you have not demonstrated full understanding of why this conduct was inappropriate or of the power dynamics at play; and that the profession might be brought into disrepute if such conduct were not met with a finding of impairment.
75. The Committee was satisfied that an informed member of the public would regard a finding of impairment as necessary to uphold the regulatory objectives. They would expect dental professionals to maintain the highest standards of professional conduct, not only in clinical practice but also in interactions with colleagues. They would expect the workplace to be a safe environment, free from sexual harassment, and that those who breach this fundamental tenet are subject to regulatory consequences.
76. The Committee noted this case involves behavioural misconduct rather than clinical misconduct. However, behavioural misconduct of this nature strikes at the heart of professional integrity and trustworthiness. Sexual harassment in the workplace is fundamentally incompatible with the standards expected of healthcare professionals and demonstrates a failure to respect the dignity and autonomy of colleagues.
77. The Committee was mindful that this was not an isolated incident but comprised multiple instances of inappropriate behaviour involving an imbalance of power. The harassment caused actual harm, and your insight remains limited.
78. The Committee considered that the gravity of the misconduct is sufficiently serious to be capable of eroding public trust in dental professionals and the GDC as a regulator. An informed member of the public would expect registrants to uphold fundamental professional standards, including treating colleagues with respect and maintaining appropriate boundaries. Where those

standards are breached in the manner found proved, a finding of impairment is necessary to maintain public confidence.

79. The Committee concluded that, given your colleagues had the right to work in a safe environment free from sexual harassment, an informed member of the public would be shocked and troubled were no impairment to be found. Such a person would regard a finding of impairment as essential to uphold the regulatory objectives.
80. Therefore, the Committee concluded that a finding of impairment is also required on the ground of public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction

81. In reaching its decision regarding sanction, the Committee carefully considered what action, if any, should be taken in relation to your registration. It had regard to the GDC's Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance (January 2026). The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate. While sanctions are not intended to be punitive, they may have that effect.
82. The Committee identified the following mitigating factors:
 - some developing understanding of the misconduct;
 - evidence of remorse and apology;
 - some reflection on the impact of the behaviour;
 - the beginnings of remediation; and
 - testimonials speaking to positive working relationships with three colleagues over an extended period, albeit they appeared to be from colleagues who worked with you some years prior to the events in question.
83. The Committee also identified the following aggravating factors:
 - the conduct was not isolated but comprised multiple instances of inappropriate behaviour;
 - lack of full understanding of the gravity of the misconduct and its impact;
 - limited remediation;
 - an imbalance of power between you and the colleagues affected;
 - and actual harm caused to a colleague.
84. The Committee was mindful that mitigation should carry less weight where there has been a fundamental and/or serious breach of the Standards. The Committee determined that the misconduct in this case did constitute such a breach, given the nature of the sexual harassment found proved and the workplace context in which it occurred.
85. The Committee noted the submission of Mr Ivill that there no evidence of repetition since these matters came to light. However, the Committee considered that this was not a mitigating factor, but rather a neutral factor as part of the Committee's wider considerations.
86. The Committee considered each available sanction in ascending order of severity, applying the principle of proportionality throughout.

No action and reprimand

87. The Committee concluded immediately that taking no action would be wholly inappropriate given its findings of serious professional misconduct and current impairment. Taking no action would fail to protect the public and would undermine confidence in the regulatory process.

88. The Committee next considered whether to issue a reprimand. It had careful regard to Mr Ivill's submissions that the misconduct was not so serious as to warrant a higher sanction and that a reprimand would be suitable. However, the Committee was not persuaded by this argument.
89. While the Committee acknowledged the mitigating factors identified, it concluded that the aggravating factors were of significantly greater weight. The misconduct involved multiple instances of workplace sexual harassment, creating an environment in which a colleague was subjected to unwanted sexual comments and behaviour. This was not a single lapse of judgment, but a pattern of conduct demonstrating a failure to respect professional boundaries.
90. The Committee was particularly concerned by the imbalance of power that existed between you and the affected colleague, and the actual harm that was caused. The right of all dental professionals to work in an environment free from sexual harassment is fundamental. Your conduct breached that right and created a hostile working environment.
91. Furthermore, while you have demonstrated some developing awareness, this remains incomplete. Your evidence suggested a limited understanding of the power dynamics at play and the full impact of your behaviour. The Committee determined that you require further time and reflection to fully appreciate the severity of the misconduct and to demonstrate meaningful behavioural change.
92. The Committee concluded that neither taking no action nor issuing a reprimand would be sufficient to address the public protection concerns identified, nor would either sanction adequately reflect the gravity of the misconduct or maintain regulatory credibility. A reprimand would not impose any restrictions on your registration and would not provide the necessary period for you to demonstrate full understanding and sustained remediation.

Conditions of practice

93. The Committee next considered whether to impose a conditions of practice order. However, it concluded that conditions would not be workable in this case. The concerns relate to attitudinal and behavioural issues involving sexual harassment and respect for professional boundaries, rather than deficiencies in clinical skills or knowledge. Such concerns are not readily amenable to conditions of practice. Furthermore, given the nature of the sexual misconduct found proved, conditions would not be sufficient to protect colleagues in the workplace, would not adequately reflect the severity of the conduct, and would not maintain public trust in the profession.

Suspension

94. The Committee went on to consider whether to suspend your registration for a specified period. It had regard to the relevant paragraphs of the Guidance which highlight factors to consider when determining whether a suspension order is appropriate, including: a serious breach of the Standards where a lesser sanction would not be sufficient; no evidence that the registrant's actions were fundamentally incompatible with continued registration; the Committee is satisfied that the registrant should not practise during the period of suspension; and the period of suspension will afford the registrant an opportunity to demonstrate insight and remediation.
95. The Committee accepted that the misconduct represented a serious breach of the Standards, particularly those relating to respecting professional boundaries and treating colleagues with dignity.
96. The Committee was satisfied that a period of suspension would serve multiple important purposes. First, it would provide you with the necessary time and impetus to properly reflect on the misconduct, to develop full understanding of its impact, and to demonstrate meaningful behavioural change. Second, it would protect colleagues in the workplace by ensuring you do not practise during a period when your fitness to practise is currently impaired. Third, it would serve the wider public interest by marking that sexual harassment in the workplace is wholly

unacceptable and sending a clear message to the profession that such conduct will not be tolerated.

97. The Committee concluded that suspension would be proportionate in this case. It would be sufficient to protect the public and serve the wider public interest, while affording you the opportunity to demonstrate that you have fully addressed the concerns identified.

Erasure

98. The Committee went on to consider whether erasure would be appropriate. It had regard to the guidance which indicates that erasure may be appropriate where the registrant's behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a registered professional, or where sexual misconduct has occurred.
99. However, the Committee concluded that erasure would not be proportionate in this case. While the Committee identified attitudinal issues in your conduct, it was satisfied that these are not so deep-seated or fundamentally incompatible with continued registration as to warrant erasure. The Committee had regard to the initial reflections you have provided and the beginnings of awareness you have demonstrated. It noted the testimonials provided on your behalf and the absence of any repetition of the behaviour since these matters came to light. The Committee was satisfied that, with appropriate time for reflection, there is a realistic prospect that you will be able to demonstrate full understanding and address the concerns identified.

Determination on sanction

100. The Committee determined that a suspension would be both proportionate to its findings and sufficient to protect the public and serve the public interest. A suspension will mark that sexual harassment in the workplace is wholly unacceptable and will send a clear message to the profession that such behaviour will be taken seriously by the regulator.
101. Having taken all the matters in this case into account, including your personal circumstances and the mitigating factors identified, the Committee determined that a suspension for a period of 12 months, with a review, would be the appropriate sanction.
102. This period will provide you with sufficient time to properly reflect on the Committee's findings, to develop full understanding of the gravity of the misconduct and its impact, and to demonstrate meaningful and sustained behavioural change. It will afford you the opportunity to address the attitudinal concerns identified and to provide evidence that you have fully understood and properly embedded the professional standards expected of all registered dental professionals.
103. In reaching a decision on the length of suspension the Committee had regard to paragraph 13 of Appendix 1 of the Guidance, which states:
- The absence of evidence that the registrant has engaged in similar conduct before or since should be considered a neutral rather than a mitigating factor. The victim being a colleague rather than a patient is not a mitigating factor. The courts have held that where the victim is a colleague, rather than a patient, "severe sanctions in such cases... are generally necessary... to protect and uphold the dignity of workers in the profession and to protect their freedom to work without being molested".*
104. The Committee was satisfied that a 12-month suspension with review will be sufficient to protect the public and serve the wider public interest, while providing you with a fair opportunity to demonstrate that you can practise safely and appropriately in the future.
105. The Committee considered that this order is necessary to send to the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of conduct required of a registered dental professional at all times. All registrants must understand that they have a fundamental

obligation to respect professional boundaries and to treat colleagues with dignity, and that failures in these areas will be met with serious regulatory consequences.

106. The Committee was aware that the effect of this order is that you will be prevented from working as a registered dental professional using a GDC registration during the period of suspension. The Committee acknowledged that this could result in financial hardship for you. However, in applying the principle of proportionality, the Committee determined that your personal interests, of which it had very limited information from you, are outweighed by the need for protection of the public and the wider public interest. The Committee was satisfied that the sanction imposed is the minimum necessary to achieve these important regulatory objectives.
107. A reviewing Committee may be assisted by the following:
 - Your continued engagement
 - Written reflection on the importance of maintaining professional boundaries, why your conduct was inappropriate and the impact that failing to do so could have on the profession and the public.
 - Targeted CPD in relation to the relevant standards highlighted in this case and your detailed written reflection on any learning, and any documented evidence of the learning being embedded.
 - Testimonials that speak to your character in relation to the specific matters determined by this Committee from current or recent colleagues.

Immediate Order (29 July 2026):

108. Having directed that your name be suspended from the register for a period of 12 months, the Committee was required to consider whether to impose an immediate order to cover the appeal period, or until any appeal against the outcome is heard.
109. The Committee considered the submissions made by Mr Saad. He submitted that an immediate order should be made on the grounds that it is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. He applied for this order to cover any possible appeal period and submitted that this would be entirely consistent with the Committee's findings and its decision to impose a 12-month suspension order.
110. Mr Ivill submitted that an immediate order is not necessary. He submitted that you do not pose any risk to patients, nor is there any suggestion of repetition. He further submitted that an immediate order is not required on public interest grounds, as the substantive suspension order itself satisfies the public interest.
111. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
112. The Committee was satisfied that an immediate order of suspension was necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. Having found that the substantive suspension order is required for both public protection and the public interest, it made the decision to impose a substantive suspension order for the maximum period of 12 months. The Committee concluded that to direct otherwise would be wholly inconsistent with its findings concerning both public protection and the public interest.
113. If, at the end of the appeal period of 28 days, you have not lodged an appeal, this immediate order will lapse and will be replaced by the substantive direction of suspension for a period of 12 months. If you do lodge an appeal, this immediate order will continue in effect until that appeal is determined.

114. Your name will be substantively suspended from the register for a period of 12 months, 28 days from the date when notice of this determination is deemed to have been served upon you, unless you lodge an appeal within that period.
115. The Committee also directs that any interim order currently on your registration in relation to this case is hereby revoked.
116. That concludes this determination.