

## PUBLIC HEARING

### Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

16 to 17 June 2025

**Name:** CORNWELL, Madeline Amy

**Registration number:** 291310

**Case number:** CAS-208717-C2S4X1

---

**General Dental Council:** Sian Priory, Counsel  
Instructed by Sarah Barker, IHLPS

**Registrant:** Not Present  
Not Represented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of caution and misconduct

**Outcome:** Erased

**Immediate order:** Immediate suspension order

---

**Committee members:** Matthew King (Chair, Dentist Member)  
Anita Clay (Lay Member)  
Joanne Brindley (Dental Care Professional Member)

**Legal Adviser:** Edward Hosking

**Committee Secretary:** Lola Bird

Madeline CORNWELL, a Dental Nurse, Diploma in Dental Nursing Level 3 QCF City & Guilds 2020 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 16 June 2025 for an inquiry into the following charge:

**The charge**

*“That being registered as a dental care professional:*

- 1. On or around 26 December 2023, you received a conditional caution from the police for the unlawful possession of a controlled drug contrary to section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and Regulation 6(6) of the Misuse of Drugs Regulations 2001;*
- 2. From 18 July 2023 to 23 October 2023, you failed to cooperate with an investigation conducted by the GDC by not providing the GDC with any or insufficient evidence of indemnity and employment details;*

*AND by reason of the matters alleged above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your caution and/or misconduct.”*

---

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee hearing in relation to a case brought by the General Dental Council (GDC) against Miss Cornwell.
2. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.
3. Miss Cornwell is not present at the hearing, and she is not represented in her absence. The Case Presenter for the GDC is Ms Sian Priory, Counsel.

**Application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the registrant**

4. At the outset, Ms Priory made an application pursuant to Rule 54 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006* (‘the Rules’), to proceed with the hearing notwithstanding Miss Cornwell’s absence.
5. Ms Priory drew the Committee’s attention to the relevant documents in respect of service. She submitted that there has been an ongoing issue in relation to Miss Cornwell’s engagement with these proceedings, and that the Committee may infer from her communications with the GDC that she does not wish to attend this hearing. In all the circumstances, Ms Priory invited the Committee to continue in Miss Cornwell’s absence.
6. The Committee took account of Ms Priory’s submissions, and the supporting documentation provided. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to service and proceeding with a hearing in the absence of a registrant.

### **Decision on service**

7. The Committee first considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Miss Cornwell in accordance with Rules 13 and 65. It had sight of the Notice of Hearing, which is erroneously dated 1 May 2024 ('the notice'), but the Committee was satisfied, taking all the other information before it into account, that the intended and correct date is 1 May 2025.

8. The notice was sent to Miss Cornwell's registered address by Special Delivery and First-Class post. The Committee noted that the copy of the notice sent by Special Delivery was returned to the GDC on 6 May 2025. However, it took into account that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove delivery of the notice, only that it was sent. The Committee was satisfied on the evidence provided that the GDC complied with the requirement to send notice.

9. The Committee further took into account that on 1 May 2025, a copy of the notice was sent to Miss Cornwell by email, and that she responded by email to the GDC on that same day.

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

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

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

12. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Cornwell. It approached this issue with the utmost care and caution. The Committee took account of the factors to be considered in reaching its decision, as set out in relevant case law, including the cases of *General Medical Council v Adeogba* and *General Medical Council v Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

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

14. The Committee was satisfied that Miss Cornwell is aware of this hearing. It noted that she has engaged with the GDC to some extent, in that she has responded to emails that have been sent to her. However, the Committee considered it clear from Miss Cornwell's communications that she does not wish to participate in these fitness to practise proceedings. It noted that in her email of 1 May 2025, which she sent in response to being notified of this hearing, she stated "*There isn't any need for a hearing I haven't worked in dentistry for nearly 2 years, I just want removing from the register and to be left alone*". In her most recent email dated 12 June 2025, Miss Cornwell reiterated this response.

15. In all the circumstances, it was the view of the Committee that adjourning the hearing would serve no meaningful purpose. Miss Cornwell has not requested an adjournment, and there is no

indication that deferring the hearing would secure her attendance on a future date. The Committee considered it clear that Miss Cornwell has voluntarily absented herself.

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

### **Case background**

17. The charge against Miss Cornwell relates to her receipt of a conditional caution from the police for the unlawful possession of a controlled drug, as well as her alleged non-cooperation with the GDC's investigation into the matter.

18. Ms Priory outlined in her opening submissions that, in June 2023 Miss Cornwell self-reported to the GDC that she had been cautioned by the police. The Committee heard that this was in respect of an incident involving the discovery of drugs in Miss Cornwell's handbag whilst she was at her place of work, a dental practice. Miss Cornwell reported that the drugs did not belong to her but belonged to a friend, although they were found in her handbag. She stated that both her solicitor and the police had been aware that the drugs did not belong to her and that is why she received a conditional caution, which she accepted.

19. Ms Priory told the Committee that as part of the GDC's investigation, Miss Cornwell was asked to provide to the Council details of her employment and her indemnity. Ms Priory drew to the Committee's attention evidence that Miss Cornwell was first asked for this information on 18 July 2023, but that she did not provide the relevant details. Ms Priory submitted that Miss Cornwell was asked again on a number of further occasions, but effectively failed, over the time period set out in head of charge 2, to provide the GDC with the information that it had requested.

### **Evidence**

20. The evidence received by the Committee is solely documentary. It was given the opportunity to hear oral evidence from the GDC's witnesses, but the Committee did not have any questions to ask of them that would assist beyond the witness statements and associated exhibits provided.

21. The documentary evidence before the Committee included the following:

- A witness statement and supplementary witness statement dated 10 February 2025 and 18 February 2025, from a Solicitor within the GDC's In-house Legal Presentation Service. The Solicitor exhibits with their witness statements disclosure documents from Derbyshire Constabulary and a copy of Miss Cornwell's 'Conditional Caution' document.
- A witness statement dated 10 February 2025, from a Caseworker in the GDC's Fitness to Practise department, who was involved in investigating Miss Cornwell's case. The Caseworker sets out in their witness statement the GDC's communications with Miss Cornwell over the relevant period, 18 July to 23 October 2023, and exhibits evidence of the requests made to her for information.

**The Committee’s findings of fact**

22. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it. It took account of Ms Priory’s closing submissions in relation to the alleged facts. She submitted that there was more than sufficient evidence within the police documents to find head of charge 1 proved. In relation to head of charge 2, which relates to a defined time period, Ms Priory submitted that the Committee would be assisted by the witness statement and exhibits provided by the GDC Caseworker.

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

24. The Committee factual findings are as follows:

<p>1.</p>	<p><i>On or around 26 December 2023, you received a conditional caution from the police for the unlawful possession of a controlled drug contrary to section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and Regulation 6(6) of the Misuse of Drugs Regulations 2001.</i></p> <p><b>Found proved.</b></p> <p>The Committee had before it the ‘Conditional Caution’ document provided by Derbyshire Constabulary relating to the offence of “<i>Unlawful possession of a controlled drug section 5(2) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 Regulation 6(6) of the Misuse of Drugs Regulations 2001</i>”.</p> <p>In making its finding, the Committee noted that there are some inaccuracies on the ‘Conditional Caution’ document. It noted that Miss Cornwell’s name is misspelt on the document, and that the document is dated ‘26 December 2024’, not ‘26 December 2023’, as alleged by the GDC.</p> <p>However, having considered all the information provided by the police in respect of the incident, which includes references to Miss Cornwell’s correct name, the Committee was satisfied that she was the subject of the conditional caution in question. It also took into account that Miss Cornwell referred herself to the GDC in June 2023, when she indicated that she had been cautioned by the police.</p> <p>Additionally, in relation to the date that Miss Cornwell received the conditional caution, the Committee was satisfied that this was on ‘26 December 2023’ as alleged by the GDC. It noted that the date ‘26 December 2023’ is consistent with the other information disclosed by the police in relation to the timeline of the events, which included Miss Cornwell’s completion of an online Drugs Awareness course on that day, 26 December 2023’.</p> <p>In all the circumstances, the Committee found head of charge 1 proved on the balance of probabilities.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p><i>From 18 July 2023 to 23 October 2023, you failed to cooperate with an investigation conducted by the GDC by not providing the GDC with any or insufficient evidence of indemnity and employment details.</i></p>

**Found proved.**

In reaching its decision, the Committee considered the chronology of the GDC's communications with Miss Cornwell, as outlined in the witness statement of the GDC Caseworker, and the supporting documentary evidence exhibited. The Committee noted that Miss Cornwell did respond to the GDC on a number of occasions during the period in question. This included her email dated 21 August 2023, in which she stated, *"I don't have indemnity insurance anymore as it's not required and I won't be paying for it again to continue with this matter as I no longer work in dentistry."*

However, the Committee took into account that the GDC not only requested from Miss Cornwell evidence of her current indemnity and employment details, but also evidence of her employment and indemnity details around the time of the incident which led to her conditional caution. In the initial letter sent to her by the GDC dated 18 July 2023, the Committee noted that under the headings 'Working arrangements' and 'Proof of Indemnity', Miss Cornwell was asked to provide information about her working arrangements and indemnity both *"now"* and *"at the time the concern relates to"*.

The Committee considered that in her email of 21 August 2023, Miss Cornwell provided the GDC with information regarding her current circumstances at that time, in that she stated that she no longer had indemnity because she was no longer working in dentistry. However, the Committee noted, having had regard to the evidence, that Miss Cornwell did not address the GDC's questions about her employment and indemnity arrangements around the time of the incident that led to her conditional caution. In an email response to Miss Cornwell, also dated 21 August 2023, the GDC Caseworker informed Miss Cornwell that, as she was still registered with the GDC, she would need to cooperate with its investigation and provide all the information requested. The Committee took account of the evidence showing the numerous unsuccessful attempts to contact Miss Cornwell to obtain the outstanding information, including by telephone.

The Committee was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that by not providing details of her employment and indemnity at the material time of her offence, despite clear and repeated requests, Miss Cornwell failed to cooperate with the GDC's investigation, as the evidence she did provide was insufficient. Accordingly, head of charge 2 is proved.

25. The hearing now moves to Stage Two.

**Stage Two of the hearing – 17 June 2025**

26. At this second stage of the hearing, the Committee has had to consider whether Miss Cornwell's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her caution. It has also had to consider whether Miss Cornwell's failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation amounts to misconduct, and if so, whether her fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of misconduct. The Committee took into account that if it found current impairment on one or both statutory grounds of caution or misconduct, it would need to consider what sanction, if any, to impose on Miss Cornwell's registration.

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

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

### **Summary of the GDC's submissions**

29. Ms Priory confirmed that Miss Cornwell has no fitness to practise history.

30. It was Ms Priory's submission that Miss Cornwell's failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation amounts to misconduct. She submitted that Miss Cornwell's failure to provide the relevant information to the Council, despite multiple, repeated requests, over several months, represents a serious departure from the GDC's '*Standards for the Dental Team*' (September 2013). In particular, Standard 9.4, which states: "*Co-operate with any relevant formal or informal inquiry and give full and truthful information*".

31. In relation to impairment, Ms Priory submitted that Miss Cornwell's fitness to practise is currently impaired on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. With regard to the criminal matter, Ms Priory noted that the police treated Miss Cornwell's offence as being at the lower end of the scale, and as such, a conditional caution was deemed appropriate. However, Ms Priory drew the Committee's attention to the evidence regarding the amount of the controlled drug found in Miss Cornwell's possession which, it was said, could have given rise to the more serious charge of intent to supply.

32. Ms Priory submitted that a dental professional being in possession of a Class A drug is unacceptable and, in this case, was compounded by the fact that Miss Cornwell took the drugs into her workplace. Ms Priory submitted that there is no evidence of any remediation or insight on the part of Miss Cornwell, so the Committee could not be reassured that her conduct would not be repeated. Furthermore, Ms Priory submitted that a criminal caution of this type is likely to bring the reputation of the dental profession into disrepute.

33. In respect of Miss Cornwell's failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation, Ms Priory submitted that Miss Cornwell was properly warned of the consequences of her failure to provide the information requested. Ms Priory submitted that Miss Cornwell's repeated failure to comply with the requests made, could be indicative of an underlying attitudinal issue. She submitted that given the absence of any evidence of insight or remediation, there is a risk that Miss Cornwell could repeat her behaviour. Ms Priory noted that Miss Cornwell has expressed a desire to be removed from the GDC Register, but so far, has not completed the necessary paperwork to do so. Ms Priory submitted that cooperation with a GDC investigation is a basic requirement for any registered dental professional, and a failure to do so, would bring the profession into disrepute.

34. Ms Priory submitted that the most appropriate and proportionate sanction in the circumstances of this case would be a 12-month suspension order, with a review. She submitted that any sanction less than a suspension would not be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest. She also submitted that Miss Cornwell's future plans remain unclear, and that a 12-

month period of suspension would afford her the opportunity to re-engage with the GDC and to undertake remediation activities.

### **Decision on misconduct**

35. The Committee first considered whether Miss Cornwell's failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation from 18 July to 23 October 2023, by not providing sufficient evidence of her employment and indemnity details, amounts to misconduct.

36. Whilst the Committee noted that Miss Cornwell did exchange messages and engaged in communications with the GDC over the period in question, she did not fully provide the information sought by the GDC, despite clear and repeated requests. The Committee considered that Miss Cornwell had ample opportunity to provide all the information the GDC asked for but instead continued to demonstrate a lack of cooperation.

37. In the Committee's view, failing to comply with requests from your regulatory body is serious, particularly in circumstances where fitness to practise is being investigated. Standard 9.4, as outlined in the GDC's submissions, makes clear that all registered dental professionals are expected to comply with any relevant informal or formal inquiry.

38. In all the circumstances, the Committee concluded that Miss Cornwell's failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation amounts to misconduct.

### **Decisions on impairment**

39. The Committee next considered whether Miss Cornwell's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her caution and/or misconduct. In doing so, it had regard to the 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.

### **Decision on impairment by reason of caution**

40. Miss Cornwell received a conditional caution for being in the possession of a Class A controlled drug, which she had taken into her workplace, a dental practice. The Committee took into account that Miss Cornwell's offence was eventually regarded by the police as being on the lower end of the spectrum, but it also noted that the amount of the Class A drug found in her possession had raised a concern with the police about an intent to supply.

41. Whilst the Committee viewed the conduct for which Miss Cornwell received a police caution to be serious, it considered that it is behaviour that is capable of being remedied. However, there is no evidence of insight, remorse or remediation before the Committee. Miss Cornwell has not engaged in any meaningful way with these proceedings. Her email responses to the GDC regarding this case, which have continued until very recently, show no acknowledgement or understanding of the gravity of the criminal incident in which she was involved, including the serious implications around taking Class A drugs into a dental practice where members of the public attend. In the

circumstances, the Committee concluded that there is a risk of repetition, and it determined that a finding of impairment is necessary for the protection of the public.

42. The Committee also determined that a finding of impairment in respect of Miss Cornwell's police conditional caution is in the wider public interest. It considered that a reasonable and informed member of the public would be alarmed if a finding of impairment were not made in relation to a dental professional who took Class A drugs into a dental practice. The Committee therefore concluded that public confidence in the dental profession would be seriously undermined in the absence of such a finding. It also took into account the need to uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

43. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Miss Cornwell's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her caution.

#### **Decision on impairment by reason of misconduct**

44. The Committee next considered Miss Cornwell's misconduct, namely her failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation over a period of several months.

45. The Committee considered Miss Cornwell's misconduct to be remediable. In considering whether it has been remedied, the Committee took into account that she has not engaged in any meaningful way with these proceedings, and so there is no evidence from her in relation to any remediation. Furthermore, it was the view of the Committee that there are ongoing issues with Miss Cornwell's insight into her lack of cooperation with her regulator. The Committee noted that she has still not provided the outstanding information sought by the GDC. The Committee considered that her persisting failure to provide important details to the Council, which includes evidence of her indemnity around the time of the incident that led to her caution, raises a serious attitudinal concern.

46. In the absence of any evidence of remediation and the continuing concern regarding Miss Cornwell's insight, the Committee concluded that there is a risk of repetition in relation to the misconduct matter. Miss Cornwell failed to cooperate with an investigation into her fitness to practise as a dental professional, and as such, the Committee considered that a finding of impairment is required on public protection grounds.

47. The Committee was also satisfied that a finding of impairment is in the wider public interest in relation to Miss Cornwell's misconduct. It considered that public confidence in the dental profession and the regulator would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances. The Committee also considered that such a finding is required to maintain and uphold proper professional standards.

48. The Committee therefore determined that Miss Cornwell's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her misconduct.

#### **Decision on sanction**

49. Having found Miss Cornwell's fitness to practise to be impaired, the Committee considered what sanction, if any, to impose on her registration. It bore in mind that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and uphold the wider

public interest. The Committee had regard to the GDC's '*Guidance for the Practice Committees including Indicative Sanctions Guidance*' (October 2016; last revised in December 2020) ('the Guidance'). It applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with Miss Cornwell's own interests.

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

- That Miss Cornwell referred herself to the GDC regarding her conditional caution.
- That she made some replies to the GDC during the period of time at head of charge 2, although she failed to fully address the information requested.
- That she has no fitness to practise history.

51. The Committee identified the following aggravating factors:

- Miss Cornwell's lack of insight into the seriousness of the police conditional caution for a registered dental professional, and that she has not sufficiently engaged with her regulatory body.
- That she has shown no remorse.
- That she has not provided any evidence of remediation.
- That she has demonstrated a blatant or wilful disregard of the role of the GDC and the systems regulating the profession.

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

53. The Committee therefore considered whether to issue Miss Cornwell with a reprimand. It concluded however, that the matters in this case are too serious for a reprimand, particularly Miss Cornwell possession of a Class A drug in her workplace. The Committee also took into account that it has identified an ongoing risk to the public and the wider public interest, and a reprimand would not impose any restrictions on Miss Cornwell's registration. In the circumstances, the Committee determined that a reprimand would not be sufficient, appropriate or proportionate.

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

55. The Committee went on to consider whether to suspend Miss Cornwell's registration for a specified period. In doing so, it had regard to paragraph 6.28 of the Guidance which states that:

*“Suspension is appropriate for more serious cases and may be appropriate when all or some of the following factors are present (this list is not exhaustive):*

- there is evidence of repetition of the behaviour;*
- the Registrant has not shown insight and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour;*
- patients’ interests would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;*
- 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)”.*

56. The took account of the above factors from paragraph 6.28 of the Guidance, and it had regard to the GDC’s submission in respect of a suspension. However, given its concerns regarding Miss Cornwell’s insight into the allegations now found proved, particularly the serious implications of taking Class A drugs into work, the Committee carefully considered whether a period of suspension would be sufficient in all the circumstances.

57. In reaching its decision, the Committee took account of paragraph 6.34 of the Guidance which deals with erasure. It identified the following factors as being relevant:

- There has been a serious departure in this case from a relevant professional standard.
- There has been a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of actions or their consequences.

58. Whilst the Committee took into account that its finding in relation to Miss Cornwell’s lack of cooperation with the GDC only covers a specified period, she has, for almost two years shown no interest in properly engaging with the fitness to practise process. In emails to the Council, she has repeatedly stated that she wishes to be left alone and that she has no intention of returning to work in dentistry. There has been no acknowledgement from her in relation to the seriousness of her actions or their potential consequences, both in respect of her conditional caution and her failure to fully comply with repeated requests for information from her regulatory body. In the Committee’s view, Miss Cornwell has continued to demonstrate a blatant disregard for the GDC and the systems for regulating dental professionals.

59. Having taken all the matters in this case into account, it was the conclusion of the Committee that a period of suspension, even for the maximum period of 12 months, would not be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest.

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

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

62. The Committee now invites submissions from Ms Priory, as to whether an immediate order of suspension should be imposed on Miss Cornwell’s registration, pending the taking effect of the Committee’s substantive direction for erasure.

### **Decision on an immediate order**

63. In considering whether to impose an immediate order of suspension on Miss Cornwell's registration, the Committee took account of Ms Priory's application that such an order should be imposed. She submitted that the ongoing risk of repetition identified by the Committee, both in regard to Miss Cornwell's criminal conduct and her non-cooperation with the GDC, means that an immediate order is necessary for the protection of the public and to uphold public confidence in the dental profession.

64. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who drew to its attention to paragraphs 6.35 to 6.38 of the Guidance and outlined the statutory test for imposing immediate orders.

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

66. In its substantive determination, the Committee has identified a risk of repetition, given the lack of any evidence of insight, remorse or remediation from Miss Cornwell. In the circumstances, the Committee considered that it would be inconsistent not to impose an immediate order for the protection of the public. It took into account that in the absence of an immediate order, Miss Cornwell could, if she wished to do so, return to unrestricted practice during the appeal period, or for longer, in the event of an appeal.

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

68. The effect of the foregoing substantive determination and this order is that Miss Cornwell's registration will be suspended to cover the appeal period. Unless she exercises her right of appeal, the substantive direction for erasure will take effect 28 days from the date of deemed service.

69. Should Miss Cornwell exercise her right of appeal, this immediate order will remain in place until the resolution of the appeal.

70. That concludes this determination.