

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

10 to 12 December 2025

Name: MADAHAR, Gaurav

Registration number: 265514

Case number: CAS-209901-K4H6P8

General Dental Council: Sharmistha Michaels, Counsel
Instructed by Holly Watt, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Represented by Colette Renton, Counsel
Instructed Katherine Whittingham, Kennedys Law

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of conviction and misconduct

Outcome: Suspension (with a review)

Duration: 9 Months

Immediate order: Not imposed

Committee members: Andrea Hammond (Chair, Dental Care Professional Member)
Peter Watson (Lay Member)
Sobiah Sattar (Dentist Member)

Legal Adviser: Alexander Coleman

Committee Secretary: Lola Bird

Gaurav Madahar, a dentist, BDS Queen Mary University of London 2016 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 10 December 2025 for an inquiry into the following charge:

The Charge

“That being registered as a dentist:

1. *On 17 March 2023, you were convicted at Peterborough Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 15 October 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.*
2. *You failed to inform the General Dental Council immediately that, on or around 15 October 2022, you had been charged with driving a motor vehicle with Excess Alcohol.*
3. *Your actions in relation to allegation 2 were:*
 - a. *Misleading, and/or*
 - b. *Dishonest*

AND that by reason of the facts alleged, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of conviction and/or misconduct.”

Mr Madahar,

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee hearing in respect of a case brought against you by the General Dental Council (GDC). The charge relates to your (on or around 15 October 2022) being charged with driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol. This subsequently resulted in your conviction for the offence in March 2023. The GDC charge also relates to your alleged failure to immediately inform the GDC that you had been charged.
2. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.
3. You are represented at these proceedings by Ms Colette Renton, Counsel. The Case Presenter for the GDC is Ms Sharmistha Michaels, Counsel.

Admissions to the charge – 10 December 2025

4. At the outset of the hearing, Ms Renton told the Committee that you admitted heads of charge 1 and 2. These matters being the fact of your conviction on 17 March 2023 of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, and your failure to immediately inform the GDC, on or around 15 October 2022, that you had been charged with that criminal offence.
5. Ms Renton told the Committee that you denied heads of charge 3a and 3b, which are the allegations that your conduct in failing to immediately inform the GDC that you had been charged was misleading and dishonest.

Summary of the opening submissions and case background

6. In opening the case for the GDC, Ms Michaels acknowledged your admissions, including in relation to your conviction. She stated, however, that she wished to highlight the relevant provisions in

relation to convictions, as contained in the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rule 2006*. Ms Michaels drew the Committee's attention to Rule 57(5), which states that:

"Where a respondent has been convicted of a criminal offence—

(a) a copy of the certificate of conviction, certified by a competent officer of a court in the United Kingdom (or, in Scotland, an extract conviction) shall be conclusive proof of the conviction; and

(b) the findings of fact upon which the conviction is based shall be admissible as proof of those facts".

7. It was Ms Michaels' submission that, even if you had not made the admission in respect of your conviction, the Committee could find the matter proved on the basis of the certified Memorandum of Conviction that has been provided.

8. Ms Michaels also addressed your admission regarding your failure to immediately inform the GDC of the criminal charge that led to your conviction. In doing so, she emphasised the Committee's power to find any admitted allegations proved by way of admission. In particular, she referred to Rule 17(4) in so far as it relates to admissions, and to the *'Guidance on admissions made at the preliminary stage of fitness to practise hearings (1 December 2025)'*.

9. In setting out the background to this case, Ms Michaels stated that you first registered with the GDC as a dentist on 27 July 2016. She told the Committee that the GDC only became aware of your conviction in May 2023 after being notified of a separate incident and conducting enquiries.

10. Ms Michaels referred the Committee to the witness statement of Witness 1, the GDC Caseworker, who was assigned to the investigation of your case. In their witness statement, Witness 1 set out the background chronology of how your conviction came to the attention of the Council. With reference to that chronology, Ms Michaels explained that the separate matter, which does not form part of this case, was that on 4 August 2022, the GDC received a Common Law Police Disclosure report. That report stated that you had been arrested on suspicion of *'Driving – Unfit Through Drink/Drugs'* and *'Driving – Fail to Stop'*. On 5 May 2023, the police confirmed to the GDC that no further action was being taken in respect of that arrest.

11. On 9 May 2023, following the confirmation of no further action by the police, the GDC carried out a Police National Computer (PNC) check. On 12 May 2023, the GDC received the PNC check results, and they showed that you were convicted on 17 March 2023 of driving with excess alcohol; the conviction that is the subject of this hearing.

12. On 12 May 2023, the GDC requested and received the Memorandum of Conviction, which confirmed that the offence that led to your conviction took place on 15 October 2022.

13. Ms Michaels drew the Committee's attention to the details in the Memorandum of Conviction confirming that on 15 October 2022, at Cambridge in the County of Cambridge, you drove a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 53

microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. Ms Michaels submitted that the drink driving limit in England is 35 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath.

14. The Memorandum of Conviction further shows that you initially pleaded not guilty to the offence but then changed your plea to guilty on the day of the trial. You were sentenced to a £162 fine and disqualified from driving for a period of 12 months, to be reduced by a period of 3 months on completion of a drink drive awareness course, which had to be completed by 16 October 2023.

15. Ms Michaels also took the Committee through the other evidence provided by the GDC for this hearing. This included the information received from the police in relation to the circumstances of your offence. It was highlighted that on 15 October 2022, the police were called to a road traffic incident where your vehicle had collided with another vehicle, and it was believed that you were under the influence of alcohol. Ms Michaels also referred the Committee to the witness statement given to the police by the driver of the other car, and their account of what had happened before and after the collision.

16. In relation to your duty to have informed the GDC, on or around 15 October 2022, that you had been charged with a criminal offence, Ms Michaels referred to Standard 9.3.1 of the GDC's '*Standard for the Dental Team (September 2013)*' ('the GDC Standards'), which states as follows:

"You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world..."

17. Ms Michaels submitted that it is the GDC's case that your failure to immediately inform the GDC of your criminal charge was misleading and dishonest. She submitted that the word 'misleading', when given its ordinary meaning, is leading someone to believe that something is true when it is not. It was her submission that one can mislead through action, as well as by omission.

18. In relation to the alleged dishonesty, Ms Michaels submitted that honesty and transparency in relation to criminal matters are a fundamental part of the standards required of registered dental professionals. She submitted that a failure to inform the GDC of criminal matters in a timely manner could lead to questions about a registrant's probity, as it has in this case.

Evidence

19. The evidence provided by the GDC at this fact-finding stage has been solely documentary and included:

- The certified Memorandum of Conviction, confirming your conviction on 17 March 2023 at Peterborough Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 15 October 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
- The PNC check results obtained by the GDC showing your conviction.
- The evidence relied upon by the police in relation to your offence, including the police case summary and the police witness statement obtained from the driver of the other vehicle.
- The witness statement of Witness1 dated 27 February 2025 along with associated exhibits.

20. The Committee was given the opportunity to hear oral evidence from Witness 1, but it was satisfied that it had no questions for this witness that would have assisted it any further with its fact-finding task. The Committee took into account that Witness 1's witness statement is effectively a production statement, introducing a number of documents which relate to matters you have admitted. The Committee noted that neither party had any questions for Witness 1 in the circumstances.

21. In terms of the evidence received from you in response to the allegations, the Committee had before it your witness statement dated 12 November 2025, along with associated exhibits. The exhibits comprised a copy of your CV, a number of character references from dental colleagues and patients, the certificate of completion in respect of your Drink Drive Offenders course dated 25 May 2023, and evidence of your Continuing Professional Development (CPD), including in Law and Ethics.

22. The Committee also heard oral evidence from you, in which you confirmed the contents of your witness statement including your admissions to heads of charge 1 and 2. You also answered a number of questions in relation to your failure to report your criminal charge to the GDC. In summary, your evidence in this regard was that you were not aware, at the material time, that you had a duty to report the matter to the GDC yourself. You reaffirmed your denial of the allegations of misleading and dishonest conduct.

The Committee's Findings of Fact – 11 December 2025

23. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it, both oral and documentary. It took account of the closing submissions made by Ms Michaels on behalf of the GDC and those made by Ms Renton on your behalf, including in relation to the test for dishonesty, as set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67 ('Ivey').

24. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the burden and standard of proof, the issue of good character, the ordinary definition of the word 'misleading', and the application of the *Ivey* test in relation to alleged dishonesty.

25. The findings made by the Committee at this stage, include confirmation that those matters admitted by you at the outset of the hearing, namely heads of charge 1 and 2, are 'Admitted and found proved'.

26. In relation to the outstanding allegations of misleading and dishonest conduct at heads of charge 3a and 3b, the Committee considered these matters separately. It 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 facts are proved on the balance of probabilities. The Committee had to decide whether what is alleged is more likely than not.

27. The Committee's findings are as follows:

1.	<i>On 17 March 2023, you were convicted at Peterborough Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 15 October 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.</i>
----	--

	Admitted and found proved.
2.	<p><i>You failed to inform the General Dental Council immediately that, on or around 15 October 2022, you had been charged with driving a motor vehicle with Excess Alcohol.</i></p> <p>Admitted and found proved.</p>
	<p><i>Your actions in relation to allegation 2 were:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Misleading</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>The Committee noted your evidence and the submissions made on your behalf that it was not your intention to deceive or to hide anything from the GDC. However, the Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser regarding the ordinary definition of the word ‘Misleading’, which is to cause another person to believe that something is true when it is not. The Committee accepted that no intention is required for misleading conduct to occur.</p> <p>You admitted that you failed to immediately inform the GDC, on or around 15 October 2022, that you had been charged with the criminal offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol. The Committee was also satisfied from the evidence that it is a matter of record that the GDC did not know about the criminal charge at or around the material time. It noted the unchallenged evidence of Witness 1, who stated in their witness statement that, <i>“I confirm that the first time the GDC became aware of the Registrant’s criminal [charge] and conviction was following the receipt of the PNC check”</i>.</p> <p>Having accepted that there is no requirement for any deliberate act to mislead, the Committee was satisfied that your omission in not letting the GDC know immediately about your criminal charge misled your regulatory body. The position was that the GDC was not told about something that may have affected your fitness to practice. In the absence of that information, the belief of the GDC would have been there were no potential concerns about your conduct that needed consideration or investigation, which was not true.</p> <p>In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that this allegation at head of charge 3a is proved.</p>
3b.	<p><i>Your actions in relation to allegation 2 were:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Dishonest</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>The Committee applied the test for dishonesty, as set out in the case of <i>Ivey</i>. Accordingly, it first considered the actual state of your knowledge or belief, at the relevant time, in relation to your duty to immediately inform the GDC about your criminal charge. The Committee took into account it is not a requirement that your belief was reasonable; the question is whether it was genuinely held.</p>



It was your evidence that you were not aware, at the material time, that you had a duty to inform the GDC that you had been charged with a criminal offence. You stated that whilst you had read the GDC Standards, this had been a long time ago when you had graduated, although you said that you may have briefly re-visited them since then.

You also referred to the previous occasion when you were arrested by the police, which was the matter communicated to the GDC on 4 August 2022 by way of the Common Law Police Disclosure report. You told the Committee in relation to that arrest, that your vehicle had been stolen and you were not involved in the incident in question. It was noted that the police closed that matter with no further action. You highlighted that on that previous occasion, it was the police who had informed the GDC about your arrest and not you. Following which, the GDC contacted you with forms that you needed to complete and required you to provide certain medical information. You told the Committee that you had expected the same to happen when you were later arrested and charged in respect of your drink driving offence on 15 October 2022.

You further told the Committee that your belief that the GDC would be informed by others was confirmed during the court hearing held in respect of your conviction. You stated that the Chair of those proceedings told you that the court would inform the GDC on your behalf.

The Committee considered your account, together with all the other evidence placed before it, including the evidence attesting to your good character. However, it was the view of the Committee, on its assessment of all the information provided, that the explanations you have given for not immediately informing the GDC about your criminal charge lack credibility.

In relation to your evidence about your limited knowledge of the GDC Standards, particularly your professional obligations around reporting, the Committee noted that you were relatively recently qualified at the time. You completed your Bachelor in Dental Surgery (BDS) in 2016. The Committee considered it unlikely that there would have been such scant regard for the GDC Standards during your training to the extent that you were completely unaware of your duty to report any criminal matters to the GDC. The Committee heard you assert that you did not consider there to be a connection between your behaviour in your personal life and your professional registration; the Committee considered that it was more likely than not that you did know there was such a connection, not least in the context of the ongoing enquiries being made by the GDC in relation to your previous arrest. The Committee also took into account your evidence that you did not tell any of your professional colleagues about your offence nor did you seek any professional advice at the time.

The Committee further noted that, around the time that you were arrested and charged in respect of your drink driving offence in October 2022, the GDC's investigation into the previous matter which arose from the Common Law Police Disclosure report in August 2022 was ongoing. You told the Committee about the steps that you were required to take as part of the GDC enquiries into that previous matter. Therefore, in the Committee's view, it must have been evident to you that criminal matters are regarded seriously by your regulatory body. The Committee considered it implausible that, in those circumstances, you would not have

appreciated the need to immediately inform the GDC yourself of your criminal charge received some two months after the police common law disclosure issue.

The Committee also considered that it was highly unlikely that you were assured during your court hearing that the court would act on your behalf in informing the GDC. The Committee noted that whilst this was a matter you raised in your oral evidence, you did not express this in the same manner in your witness statement prepared in advance of this hearing. Furthermore, the assurance that you said the court gave you was not effected. There is no record of the court having contacted the GDC. The Committee also noted that this allegation of dishonesty relates to your duty to have informed the GDC when you were charged with the criminal offence; the court proceedings related to the later stage of your conviction.

The Committee also considered a number of other matters which raised concern regarding your credibility. These included the consistent accounts of the police and the driver of the other vehicle, which differed from your account of the circumstances following the incident on 15 October 2022. The Committee was also concerned that the police statement referred to your claiming to have a health condition, which you yourself in your police interview and in your evidence to the Committee indicated you do not have.

Having considered matters in the round, the Committee did not accept that you genuinely believed that the responsibility for informing the GDC of your criminal charge rested with the police and/or the court. The Committee was satisfied that it was more likely than not that you knew that you were personally obliged to report your criminal charge to the GDC on or around the time it happened. It was the view of the Committee that you did not do so because you were fully aware that reporting the matter would instigate another investigation by the Council, as had happened following the Common Law Police Disclosure report in August 2022.

Having established your actual state of knowledge and belief as to the facts, the Committee considered whether your conduct would be considered dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. It was the conclusion of the Committee that, deliberately failing to immediately inform your regulatory body about a criminal charge in order to avoid investigation, is conduct that would be regarded as dishonest by ordinary decent people.

Accordingly, this allegation at head of charge 3b is proved.

28. The hearing now moves to Stage Two.

Stage Two of the hearing – 11 to 12 December 2025

29. The Committee's considerations at this stage were whether the facts found proved in relation to your failure to immediately inform the GDC of your criminal charge for driving with excess alcohol amounts to misconduct. If so, whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of that misconduct and/or by reason of your conviction for the same offence. The Committee noted that if it found current impairment on one or both statutory grounds, it would need to decide what sanction, if any, to impose on your registration.

30. In reaching its decisions, the Committee took into account all the evidence placed before it at the fact-finding stage, and the further evidence provided at this second stage. The evidence received at this stage comprised a 'Stage 2 Bundle' submitted on your behalf which contained your reflective statement dated 5 December 2025 and a number of testimonials. Also received by the Committee was your supplemental statement dated 11 December 2025.

The facts found proved

31. You admitted, and the Committee found proved that on 17 March 2023, you were convicted at Peterborough Magistrates Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 15 October 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

32. You also admitted, and the Committee found proved that you failed to inform the GDC immediately, on or around 15 October 2022, that you had been charged with the criminal offence that led to your conviction. The Committee found proved that your failure to inform your regulatory body of the matter was both misleading and dishonest. It was satisfied that you knew that you were personally obliged to report your criminal charge to the GDC on or around the time it happened, but that you did not do so because you were fully aware that reporting the matter would instigate an investigation into your criminal conduct.

Summary of parties' submissions

33. Ms Michaels submitted that the Committee had before it the Memorandum of Conviction in relation to your conviction in March 2023, and therefore it followed that the statutory ground for impairment by reason of conviction was established.

34. Ms Michaels submitted that whether the statutory ground for impairment by reason of misconduct is also established in this case, would be a matter for the Committee's judgement. The alleged misconduct matters are your misleading and dishonest conduct in failing to immediately inform the GDC that you had been charged with a criminal offence.

35. Ms Michaels referred to a number of legal authorities, which she said may assist the Committee in defining the concept of misconduct. She highlighted from the case law that, misconduct is a word of general effect, involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances. Further, the standard of propriety may often be found by reference to the rules and standards ordinarily required to be followed in the particular circumstances. Ms Michaels further highlighted that for misconduct to be established, the conduct concerned must be serious.

36. Ms Michaels submitted that when considering what would be regarded as proper in the circumstances of this case, the Committee should have regard to the GDC Standards. She submitted that the GDC Standards make clear that dental professionals should not bring the dental profession into disrepute, and that informing the GDC of any criminal matters is fundamental to maintaining public confidence in the profession and ensuring patient safety. She submitted that honesty and transparency are expected of all dental professionals.

37. It was Ms Michaels' submission that your failure to inform the GDC of your criminal charge breached the following GDC Standards: 1.3.2, 1.9, 9.1 and 9.3.1. She submitted that your failure inhibited the GDC's ability, as a regulator, to assess any risk to the public at that time. She asked the Committee to take into account that the nature of your conviction, which was for drink driving, put members of the public at risk of harm. Ms Michaels stated that your misleading and dishonest conduct was serious and represented a significant falling short of the expected standards. It was her submission that the Committee could safely find misconduct in the circumstances of this case.

38. In addressing the issue of impairment, Ms Michaels again referred to relevant legal authorities. She submitted that the Committee would need to consider whether the issues in this case are remediable, whether they have been remedied and whether they are highly likely to be repeated. She stated that, in addition, the Committee would need to take into account wider public interest considerations; in particular, whether the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances of this case.

39. With regard to impairment by reason of your conviction, Ms Michaels reiterated that your drink driving offence put members of the public at risk. She acknowledged that there is no evidence of any further offences since 15 October 2022. She submitted however, that it was unclear from the statements you have provided and from your oral evidence, given at the first stage of this hearing, what you have done to ensure there is no repetition, apart from your completion of the Drink Drive Awareness course offered to you by the court. Ms Michaels also submitted that you failed to address in the evidence of your remediation, the wider impact of your drink driving on the public and the dental profession, including after the collusion occurred. Furthermore, Ms Michaels submitted, that you have not mentioned the impact on the driver of the other vehicle.

40. Ms Michaels submitted that, given the limited evidence of your insight and remediation in relation to your conviction, the Committee could not be reassured that there is no risk of repetition. She also submitted that the concerns arising from your conviction are such that if a finding of impairment is not made, public confidence in the dental profession and the maintenance of good standards would be undermined.

41. In relation to the misconduct aspect of this case, Ms Michaels highlighted your oral evidence, given at the fact-finding stage of these proceedings, that you had only reviewed the GDC Standards four months ago. Ms Michaels also highlighted that the Legal and Ethics course you completed was undertaken in September of this year. She submitted that there had been a delay in your remediation, which she said showed a disregard for professional standards or, at the very least, a lack of insight into the issues before this Committee. Ms Michaels referred the Committee to a number of paragraphs within the GDC's '*Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance (October 2016; last reviewed in December 2020)*' ('the Guidance'). These included paragraph 4.7, which states that:

"Evidence of remediation should be precise and detailed in cases of both clinical misconduct and personal misconduct, including misconduct relating to attitudinal failings or specific types of misconduct, for example, dishonesty..."

42. It was Ms Michaels' submission that the evidence before the Committee in relation to your insight into your dishonesty is neither precise nor detailed. It was her submission that there is, in fact, limited evidence of insight and remediation before the Committee in relation to the misconduct matters. She submitted that whilst you had demonstrated some insight into your failure to immediately inform the GDC of your criminal charge, that insight is still in the early stages. In the circumstances, Ms Michaels invited the Committee to find current impairment in respect of the misconduct matters.

43. In relation to sanction, Ms Michaels invited the Committee to have regard to the mitigating and aggravating features in this case, and she outlined a number of factors for its consideration. She submitted that the Committee should impose a sanction that reflects the gravity of your breaches and to safeguard the public. She stated that this is not a case that is so serious that the sanction of erasure is required. She submitted, however, that in order to mark the seriousness of the matters found proved and to demonstrate how seriously such matters are taken, the Committee should impose a suspension order on your registration for a period of between 9 and 12 months, with a review. Ms Michaels submitted that this would allow sufficient time for you to reflect on the conduct found proved and to work on your insight and remediation.

44. Ms Renton agreed with the submission made by the GDC that the statutory ground for impairment by conviction is established in this case.

45. Ms Renton stated that it was also conceded that the Committee's findings in respect of the alleged misconduct matters, namely your misleading and dishonest conduct in failing to immediately inform the GDC of your criminal charge, was a serious breach of the identified GDC Standards.

46. However, Ms Renton asked the Committee, when considering where your conduct falls in the range of misconduct, to take into account the following:

- That the allegations found proved were part of a single course of events, in that there was a criminal charge, your failure to notify the GDC of that charge and then your conviction of the offence.
- That this was a one-off event in the context of an otherwise unblemished record.
- That your conviction was dealt with by way of a relatively modest fine and the offer of a Drink Drive Awareness course.
- That your criminal case fell into the bottom category of the sentencing guidelines.
- That whilst dishonesty is always serious, when considering the range of such cases, this case is not at the top end.

47. Ms Renton referred the Committee to paragraph 61 of the Guidance, which states that:

“Dishonesty can take many forms, with some being more serious than others. Some forms of dishonest conduct can destroy trust instantly, whilst others can merely undermine it to a greater or lesser extent. Dishonest conduct may be considered less serious in cases of:

- *One-off incidents;*
- *...*
- *No direct personal gain;*
- *No risk to patients;*
- *Incidents in private life”.*

48. It was Ms Renton’s submission that the above factors from paragraph 61 of the Guidance are applicable in this case.

49. Ms Renton went on to address the three statements that you provided for this hearing, which included your supplemental statement prepared after the Committee’s findings of fact were handed down. Ms Renton stated that this was because you wanted to make it absolutely clear that you accepted the Committee’s findings.

50. With regard to the issue of impairment, Ms Renton submitted that considering impairment is a forward facing exercise, in that the Committee must consider whether your fitness to practise is impaired currently. Ms Renton conceded that, given that there has been a finding of dishonesty, it was likely that it would be determined that your fitness to practise is currently impaired. However, it was her submission, that the basis of any finding of impairment, should be on wider public interest grounds alone, and not because of any need to protect the public.

51. Ms Renton stated that the three statements you have provided at this hearing, set out your reflections and demonstrate how your insight has developed. It was her submission that the reading of those documents would show that you have considered the matters in this case at length, put in a considerable amount of work, and that you have looked at the ‘then’ and ‘now’. Ms Renton submitted that the Committee should not place too much weight on the dates of your statements but should focus on what it is you have said. She submitted that you show good insight into both your conviction and your dishonesty. She stated that you make clear that you do not condone your actions and she highlighted your evidence that you no longer drink alcohol at all if driving. Ms Renton submitted that whilst it is recognised that the Drink Drive Awareness course was offered as part of your court sentence, the Committee should not underestimate your learning from it. She also drew the Committee’s attention to your completion of a course on use of alcohol as part of your CPD.

52. Ms Renton stated that you have accepted on multiple occasions that you breached the standards expected of you. She submitted that you have undertaken reflection and structured learning in this regard, including further study of the GDC Standards. She stated that it was clear from the oral evidence that you gave at the first stage, that you know now what you should have done in terms of reporting your criminal charge to the GDC. Ms Renton asked the Committee to consider the evidence of your remorse and your apology to the Committee and to the profession.

53. Ms Renton outlined what she referred to as your CPD in relevant topics by way of ‘in depth’ courses. Ms Renton also referred in detail to the positive testimonials tendered on your behalf which, she said, were provided by people from a range of backgrounds, including patients, all of whom are aware of the matters in this case. She submitted that the Committee could attach weight to the testimonials provided.

54. Ms Renton further addressed the evidence of the measures you have taken to prevent a recurrence of your past failings, including creating a regulatory reporting application, having access to resources if you have a regulatory question, and having open discussions with your colleagues about regulatory compliance. It was Ms Renton's submission that the Committee could be reassured that the risk of repetition in relation to your conviction and your dishonesty is extremely low. She stated that there has been a "*huge attitude shift*" on your part. She highlighted that you have actively engaged with the GDC's investigation and this process. She submitted that it is clear from your evidence that you value being a member of the dental profession and that you are not prepared to put that at risk again.

55. In relation to sanction, Ms Renton acknowledged that, given the finding of dishonesty, the issue of a reprimand would be considered highly unusual. However, she asked the Committee to note that there are factors in this case which may mean a reprimand could apply. Ms Renton submitted that whether a conditions of practice order would be workable was a matter for the Committee. She stated that you would not oppose the imposition of conditions.

56. Ms Renton noted the GDC's submission was for a suspension order. She recognised that as part of any consideration of a suspension, the sanction of erasure would also need to be considered. It was her submission, however, that the Committee could step back from erasure. Ms Renton submitted that if the Committee were persuaded to direct a suspension, it should impose an order for less time than suggested by the GDC. She submitted that, given the evidence put before the Committee in respect of your remediation so far, 9 to 12 months would be disproportionate. She said that the Committee should bear in mind the risk of deskilling, the impact that these proceedings have had on you and the impact of any suspension order.

The Committee's decisions – 12 December 2025

57. The Committee considered all the evidence provided. It took account of the submissions made by Ms Michaels on behalf of the GDC and those made by Ms Renton on your behalf.

58. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the legal principles and guidance applicable at this stage, how it should approach its decision-making and the need to give reasons for each decision made. The Committee bore in mind that its decisions were for its independent judgement regardless of the submissions of parties. There is no burden or standard of proof at this stage of the proceedings.

Decision on misconduct

59. The alleged misconduct matters are your misleading and dishonest conduct in failing immediately to inform the GDC that you had been charged with a criminal offence. In considering whether these facts found proved amount to misconduct, the Committee took into account that a finding of misconduct in the regulatory context requires a serious falling short of the professional standards expected of a registered dental professional.

60. In considering what was expected of you in the circumstances of this case, the Committee had regard to the GDC Standards, and was satisfied that the following are engaged:

1.3 Be honest and act with integrity.

1.3.2 You must make sure you do not bring the profession into disrepute.

1.9 You must find out about laws and regulations that affect your work and follow them.

9.1 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.

9.3.1 You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world...

61. The Committee was in no doubt that your conduct in not immediately informing the GDC of your criminal charge was conduct that fell far below what was required of you. The GDC Standards are clear on this issue. It is a fundamental obligation of your registration to engage with your regulatory body in respect of any criminal matters that you face. By failing to do so, you undermined the GDC's regulatory function, which is protecting the public and the wider public interest.

62. Furthermore, the Committee found that your failure to declare your criminal charge was deliberate. In fact, you neglected to inform the GDC at all about the criminal matters, from October 2022 until May 2023, and ultimately, it was only after the GDC conducted a PNC check that your conviction was discovered. Honesty and integrity are fundamental tenets of the dental profession, and as such, dishonesty will always be serious. The Committee was satisfied that your dishonesty towards the GDC was a significant breach of the expected standard and that it was behaviour towards the top end of the spectrum, given the nature of the information that you intentionally failed to disclose.

63. Accordingly, the Committee determined that the relevant facts found proved amount to misconduct. It noted that it was conceded on your behalf that misconduct is made out on these facts.

Decisions on impairment

64. The Committee next considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct and/or your conviction. In doing so, it had regard to the overarching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety, and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession. The Committee also took into account the relevant legal principles brought to its attention.

Decision on impairment by reason of conviction

65. The Committee first considered the issue of your conviction. It had regard to the nature and circumstances of your offence, which was for drink driving. On 15 October 2022, whilst you were driving with excess alcohol, you were involved in a road traffic incident where your car collided with another

vehicle. The Committee considered, and it was not disputed by you, that this was a very serious offence. The Committee took into account that your actions and behaviour put members of public at risk of harm.

66. The Committee took into account that you were sentenced by the court in relation to your offence, which included a fine and a period of disqualification from driving. The Committee noted that you have completed the Drink Drive Awareness course offered to you by the court. It also bore in mind that there is no evidence before it at this hearing of any repeat offending since October 2022, which is now over three years ago. The Committee had regard to these factors in its consideration of the risk of repetition. The Committee also had regard to your written evidence and your oral evidence given at the first stage of the hearing, which included your evidence that you no longer drink alcohol at all if driving.

67. The Committee also took into account that you have shown remorse for your drink driving behaviour, and it was satisfied, having heard from you that you are fully aware of the potential risks and consequences should such conduct recur, including in relation to your registration. It was the view of the Committee having considered all the evidence, including of the steps you have taken around your learning, such as your CPD in the use of alcohol, that it is highly unlikely that you would repeat your offending.

68. However, the Committee considered the wider public interest, as it is required to do. It took into account the nature and seriousness of your offence and concluded that public confidence in the dental profession and the maintenance of proper professional standards would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in all the circumstances.

69. The Committee therefore determined that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction.

Decision on impairment by reason of misconduct

70. You failed to report immediately to the GDC that you had been charged with a criminal offence. The Committee considered that it is possible to remedy such a failing, albeit after the event, by recognising the omission and also the significance of the failing. The Committee took into account that your failure in this case included the element of dishonesty, which is an attitudinal issue and therefore, in its view, a more difficult concern to remedy, although not impossible.

71. Therefore, in considering whether you have in fact remedied the misconduct that has been found against you, the Committee assessed your evidence, both written and oral, for any insight into the significance of your failing and for any evidence of relevant remediation.

72. It was the conclusion of the Committee, based on what it has seen and heard, that you have demonstrated some insight into your failure to immediately report your criminal charge to the GDC. It also considered that you have taken some, although limited, steps to prevent recurrence. It noted the evidence drawn to its attention regarding your efforts to ensure that you remain compliant with your regulatory requirements and it noted that you have reviewed the GDC Standards.

73. However, the Committee was not satisfied that it received sufficient evidence of your insight and reflection in relation to the significance of your breach in failing to inform and into your associated

dishonesty. Honesty and integrity are fundamental to the dental profession, and failing to impart such crucial information about yourself to the GDC undermined the regulatory process. Whilst the Committee acknowledged that you are now more aware of your professional obligations, including in relation to declaring any criminal proceedings, it was not satisfied that you have demonstrated adequate understanding of the seriousness of your dishonesty. In the Committee's view, you have not yet shown that you have taken full responsibility for your omission and the impact that had on the GDC's ability to be an effective regulator.

74. The Committee agreed that the risk of you repeating your misconduct is somewhat reduced on account of these proceedings. However, given its concerns about the limited nature of your insight, reflection and remediation, the Committee could not conclude that the risk is entirely removed.

75. In light of this identified potential for repetition, the Committee considered the issue of public protection is engaged in this case, taking into account that a failure to report criminal matters to one's regulator impacts on the ability to assess fitness to practise for the safety of the public. However, the Committee was of the view that the wider public interest is more significantly engaged in relation to the misconduct matters. Your dishonest failure to immediately report your criminal charge to the GDC breached fundamental tenets of the profession and brought the profession into disrepute. In addition, you have failed to fully grasp the seriousness of what you did and why your failure mattered.

76. Having taken all the circumstances into account, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Decision on sanction

77. The Committee went on to consider what sanction, if any, to impose on your registration. It took into account that the purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee took into account that its ongoing concerns in this case primarily relate to wider public interest considerations.

78. The Committee had regard to the Guidance. It applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your interests.

79. In deciding on the appropriate sanction, the Committee considered the issue of mitigating and aggravating factors. In mitigation, the Committee considered the following:

- Evidence of your good character, in that you had no convictions prior to March 2023 and no fitness to practise history with the GDC.
- There is evidence of some steps taken to avoid repetition in relation to your misconduct.

80. The Committee identified the following aggravating factors:

- Actual harm or risk of harm to another.
- Dishonesty.

- Whilst there is no evidence of financial gain, the Committee did consider the general issue of personal gain, in that by failing to inform the GDC of your criminal charge, you evaded accountability for a period of time.
- Your misconduct continued over a period of time and was only discovered following a PNC check by the GDC.
- Blatant or wilful disregard of the role of the GDC and the systems regulating the profession.
- Limited insight.

81. Having had regard to the above factors, the Committee considered the available sanctions. It started with the least restrictive as it was required to do. The Committee took into account that it was open to it to conclude this case without taking any action in relation to your registration, however, it considered that this would be wholly inappropriate, given the seriousness of its findings and the reasons for your impairment. In its view, concluding this case with no action would not satisfy the wider public interest.

82. The Committee next considered whether to issue with a reprimand. In doing so, it took into account the submissions made on your behalf regard the applicability of some of the factors for issuing a reprimand. However, the Guidance makes clear that a reprimand may be appropriate where the misconduct is at the lower end of the spectrum. In the Committee's view, this is not such a case. It concluded that a reprimand would not be sufficient to maintain public confidence in the profession or to maintain proper professional standards.

83. The Committee considered whether to impose a conditions of practice order on your registration. It noted that this is not a case where discrete aspects of your clinical practice are problematic. In fact, no clinical concerns have been raised. Taking this into account, the Committee was not satisfied that conditions of practice would be appropriate, workable or measurable in a case such as this, which relates to the serious matters of your conviction and to your conduct towards your regulator, including dishonesty. In the circumstances, the Committee decided that conditions would not be appropriate or proportionate.

84. The Committee next considered whether to suspend your registration for a specified period of up to 12 months, which is the maximum suspension period that can be imposed. It had regard to paragraph 6.28 of the Guidance, which states that "*Suspension is appropriate for more serious cases ...*". The Committee was of the view that this is a serious case, and it considered that the most relevant factors from paragraph 6.28 of the Guidance are as follows:

- public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;
- there is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems (which might make erasure the appropriate order).

85. In considering your misconduct in particular, the Committee took into account that dishonesty is an attitudinal issue, but it did not consider that your dishonesty was such that it cannot be remedied. The Committee was satisfied that there was no evidence before it that you have a harmful deep-seated attitudinal problem.

86. However, the Committee remained mindful of the seriousness of your misconduct and considered whether the highest sanction, namely erasure, could still be appropriate in this case. In reaching its conclusion, Committee had regard to paragraph 6.34 of the Guidance which deals with erasure. In doing so, it noted that factors relevant to erasure are present in this case, in that there have been serious departures from a number of relevant standards. Also, there is the issue of your dishonesty. Notwithstanding this, the Committee noted that your dishonesty was not covered up, once discovered, and you have demonstrated some insight into your wrongdoing in this case, and you have taken some steps to address the arising concerns. Taken this into account, the Committee decided that erasure would be disproportionate and punitive. Whilst the matters in this case are serious, the Committee did not consider that this was to the extent that your behaviour is fundamentally incompatible with being a dental professional.

87. The Committee therefore determined that an order of suspension is the appropriate and proportionate sanction. It decided to direct the suspension of your registration for a period of 9 months. In deciding on this period, the Committee considered principally the need to uphold the wider public interest by marking the seriousness of your conviction and your misconduct, as well as the time that would be required for you to demonstrate evidence of more developed insight and further remediation.

88. The Committee also directs a review of the suspension order, to be conducted at a resumed hearing to be held shortly before the expiry of the 9 month period. The Committee at the resumed hearing will consider what action to take in respect of your registration at that time.

89. This Committee considered that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by receiving the following from you:

- Evidence of your further reflection, remediation and developed insight, including how your behaviour in this case impacted on the public's perception of the dental profession.
- Any other evidence that you consider may be helpful.

90. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, your registration will be suspended for a period of 9 months, starting 28 days from the date that notice of this Committee's direction is deemed to have been served upon you.

91. The Committee now invites submissions from Ms Michaels and from Ms Renton, as to whether an immediate order of suspension should be imposed on your registration to cover the 28-day appeal period, pending the taking effect of its substantive direction for suspension.

Decision on an immediate order – 12 December 2025

92. Ms Michaels made no application for the imposition of an immediate order on your registration. She noted that the sanction imposed by the Committee is primarily to uphold the wider public interest and submitted that no immediate order was sought by the GDC in the circumstances. Ms Renton agreed with the GDC's position in relation to an immediate order.

93. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who drew to its attention the statutory test for immediate orders and confirmed the relevant paragraphs to be considered in the Guidance.

94. In all the circumstances, the Committee determined not to impose an immediate order on your registration. It was satisfied that this is not a case where your behaviour is considered to pose a risk and there have been no concerns regarding your clinical practice. The Committee took into account that there are serious matters in this case but, in its view, they are not of the kind that require immediate action to protect public confidence in the profession. The Committee was satisfied that the substantive order of suspension is sufficient to uphold the wider public interest. It therefore concluded that imposing an immediate order would be disproportionate.

95. Accordingly, unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive direction for suspension for a period of 9 months (with a review) will take effect 28 days from the date of deemed service.

96. That concludes this determination.