

**Professional Conduct Committee  
Review Hearing**

**27 February 2026**

**Name:** THOMAS, Sophie

**Registration number:** 307763

**Case number:** CAS-209491- F5X3T5

---

**General Dental Council:** Instructed by Georgina Mayles, IHLPS

**Registrant:** Unrepresented

---

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

**Outcome:** Suspension extended (with a review)

**Duration:** 12 months

---

**Committee members:** Martin Isherwood (Chair, Dental Care Professional member)  
Nicola Jordan (Dentist member)  
Susan Parkins (Lay member)

**Legal adviser:** Gerard Coll

**Committee Secretary:** Sara Page

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee pursuant to section 27C of the '*Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)*' ('the Act'). Members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, are participating via Microsoft Teams in line with the General Dental Council's (GDC) current practice of holding hearings remotely.
2. Neither party was present at today's hearing, following a request for the review of the interim order to be conducted on the papers. The hearing was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current General Dental Council (GDC) practice.
3. In the absence of both parties, the Committee first considered the issues of service and whether to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Thomas and any representatives for either party. The Committee accepted the advice of the legal adviser on these matters.

#### **Decision on service of Notice of Hearing**

4. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Thomas was neither present nor represented at today's hearing.
5. In her absence, the Committee first considered whether the Notice of Hearing ('the Notice') had been served on Miss Thomas in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the '*General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*' ('the Rules').
6. The Committee had regard to the indexed hearing bundle of 71 pages, which contained a copy of the Notice, dated 12 January 2026. The Notice was sent to Miss Thomas' registered address by Special Delivery and first class post on 12 January 2026, in accordance with Section 50A of the '*Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)*' ('the Act') and via email on the same date.
7. The Committee was satisfied that the Notice contained proper and correct information relating to today's hearing. This included the time, date and that it is being conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams, as well as notification of the GDC's intention to conduct the review on the papers and in the absence of the parties.
8. Whilst it is not a requirement of the Rules, the Committee had sight of an extract from the Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' service which showed the item was delivered to Miss Thomas' registered address on 13 January 2026. It was signed for against the printed name of 'RHOMAS'.
9. In light of the information available, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Thomas has been served with proper notification of this hearing, with at least 28 days' notice, in accordance with the Rules.

#### **Decision on whether to proceed in the absence of Miss Thomas and on the papers**

10. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Thomas and any representative for either party. The Committee was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of Miss Thomas must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. The legal adviser reminded the Committee of the requirement to

be fair to both parties, as well as considering the public interest in the expeditious review of this case and referred to relevant case law.

11. The Committee noted that there has not been any engagement by Miss Thomas in relation to today's review hearing despite numerous attempts made by the GDC to contact her both by email and telephone.
12. In addition, the Committee noted an email from Miss Thomas, dated 8 August 2025, provided for the purposes of the initial hearing, in which she stated, '*...I'm no longer under the GDC...*' which the Committee took to infer that Miss Thomas is no longer practising as a dental professional and therefore unlikely to engage in today's review.
13. The Committee bore in mind that today's hearing has been arranged as there is a statutory requirement for the substantive order imposed on Miss Thomas' registration to be reviewed before it expires on 1 April 2026. It noted that no application for an adjournment had been made by Miss Thomas and there was no information before the Committee that adjourning would secure her attendance at a later date as a result of her lack of engagement with these proceedings. On the basis of the information before it, the Committee concluded that Miss Thomas had voluntarily absented herself from today's hearing.
14. In all these circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing on the papers and in the absence of the parties.

### **Background**

15. This hearing was convened to review the current suspension order, which is due to expire on 1 April 2026.
16. This is the first review of a substantive order initially imposed by the Professional Conduct Committee ('the PCC') in August 2025. The findings against Miss Thomas included a conviction from the Magistrates' Court of Torremolinos of an offence against traffic safety and also failing to immediately inform the GDC of the conviction which was found to be misleading and dishonest.
17. At the initial substantive hearing, the PCC found Miss Thomas' fitness to practise impaired by reason of misconduct. The PCC's findings can be summarised as follows:

*'The Committee takes a serious view of Miss Thomas' misleading and dishonest conduct in failing to disclose her conviction to the GDC at the earliest opportunity. Acting with honesty and integrity is a fundamental tenet of the dental profession. Standard 9.3 of the Council's Standards for the Dental Team, states that Registrants "must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against you anywhere in the world". In the Committee's judgement, Miss Thomas should have been aware of her professional obligations and if she was in any doubt as to whether or not she should declare her conviction she should have sought advice. The Committee is also satisfied that Miss Thomas breached Standard 1.3: "You must be honest and act with integrity" and Principle 9 "Make sure your personal behaviour maintains patients' confidence in you and the dental profession".*

*Accordingly, the Committee has concluded that the facts found proved are sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct.'*

18. The PCC gave the following reasons for its finding of current impairment:

*'The Committee has had regard to Miss Thomas' email to the GDC dated 2 November 2023 in which she provides additional information in relation to the incident in question on 22 May 2023. She accepted that she made a "foolish decision to move the car to the vacant parking slot. I accidentally drove on the wrong side of the road as I'm not familiar with the roads. I was stopped by police and breathalysed." Miss Thomas describes the incident as being totally out of character and sets out how the incident has impacted on her.*

*While noting Miss Thomas' explanation of events, the Committee notes the absence of any reflection or insight from Miss Thomas in relation to how her conduct is likely to impact on the reputation of dental professionals or how she might act differently in the future. There is no mention of Miss Thomas having familiarised herself with the GDC's guidance in relation to reporting criminal convictions. In the absence of such evidence, the Committee considers that Miss Thomas' dishonest conduct may be repeated. The Committee considers that a repetition of such conduct would further damage the reputation of the profession.'*

19. The PCC directed that Miss Thomas' registration be subject to suspension for a period of six months, with a review, stating:

*'...most of the following factors are present:*

- the registrant has not shown insight and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour;*
- 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.*

*The Committee was satisfied that the misconduct in this case, although serious, was not fundamentally incompatible with Miss Thomas remaining on the register. The Committee has also borne in mind that Miss Thomas co-operated with the GDC's investigation into this matter. It considered that a period of suspension would give Miss Thomas sufficient time to engage with these proceedings and reflect on her dishonest conduct.*

*Balancing all these factors, the Committee directs Miss Thomas' registration be suspended for a period of 6 months. This is necessary to maintain and uphold public confidence in the profession, whilst sending the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a dental nurse.*

*The reviewing Committee may be assisted by:*

- Miss Thomas' attendance at the review hearing*

- *Miss Thomas providing a detailed reflective statement demonstrating her insight into the upholding of the GDC's Standards, including an understanding of the importance of being honest.'*

### **Submissions**

20. In its written submissions, the GDC invited the Committee to extend the current order of suspension for a further period of 12 months. The GDC stated that since the initial hearing, Miss Thomas has not engaged nor has she provided evidence in line with the Committee's recommendations, namely a detailed reflective statement demonstrating her insight into the upholding of the Council's Standards, including an understanding of the importance of being honest.
21. The GDC therefore submitted that a further period of suspension would be the most appropriate and proportionate order under the circumstances. It stated that Miss Thomas has failed to engage with the proceedings, and in absence of any insight and/or reflection into her dishonest conduct, an order remains necessary to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. The GDC submitted that this will provide Miss Thomas with further opportunity to actively engage with the GDC and to provide evidence in line with the Committee's recommendations.
22. In light of this, the GDC submitted that it would be appropriate and proportionate to extend the order of suspension for a period of 12 months, with a review.
23. Miss Thomas has not provided any written submission for consideration by the Committee regarding today's review.

### **Decision and reasons on review**

24. The Committee considered whether Miss Thomas' fitness to practise remains impaired. In reaching its decision on the issue of impairment, the Committee exercised its own independent judgement. It bore in mind that its duty is to consider the public interest, which includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
25. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the legal adviser.
26. The Committee had regard to the bundle provided today and the evidence placed before the initial PCC. In deciding whether Miss Thomas' fitness to practise remains impaired, the Committee considered whether there is any evidence that Miss Thomas has addressed the shortcomings that led to the imposition of the suspension order in September 2025. It took into account that the PCC found that Miss Thomas' fitness to practise was impaired on the ground of public interest alone and that no public safety concerns has been identified.
27. Since the imposition of the order, there has been no engagement at all from Miss Thomas. There is no evidence before the Committee that she has attempted to demonstrate insight into her failings or the importance of honesty and adhering to the Standards.
28. As a result, the Committee concluded that Miss Thomas' fitness to practise remains impaired on the ground of public interest.

29. On the matter of sanction, the Committee had regard to the *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (6 January 2026)'*. The Committee considered what, if any, sanction to impose in this case. The Committee was aware of the range of sanctions available to it and that it must consider the sanctions in order from the least serious.
30. The Committee was aware that it should have regard to the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against Miss Thomas' interests. The public interest includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding standards of conduct and performance within the profession.
31. In its consideration of taking no further action, the Committee concluded that this would be neither appropriate nor proportionate as it was satisfied that an informed member of the public would be shocked if no action was taken in a case where a registrant is found to have acted dishonestly and not addressed any of the PCC's concerns relating to a lack of engagement or insight.
32. Next, the Committee considered the imposition of a reprimand. Again, due to the continued lack of engagement, the Committee concluded that this sanction would be inappropriate as Miss Thomas has demonstrated a disregard for the regulatory process by her continued non-engagement.
33. In its consideration of conditional registration, the Committee noted that Miss Thomas has failed to demonstrate any insight since the imposition of the suspension order in September 2025 and whilst her conduct was isolated in nature, she has failed to demonstrate any remorse. Further, Miss Thomas has not given any indication that she is willing to comply with conditions of practice.
34. The Committee then considered a further period of suspension and concluded that an extension for a further 12 months would be the minimum restriction required to adequately and proportionately address the public interest concerns identified. This would also provide Miss Thomas with a period of time to re-engage with the GDC and demonstrate insight, remorse and any remediation that may allow consideration of her returning to unrestricted practice in the future.
35. As stated by the previous PCC, any reviewing Committee may be assisted by:
  - Miss Thomas' attendance at the review hearing; and
  - Miss Thomas providing a detailed reflective statement demonstrating her insight into the upholding of the GDC's Standards, including an understanding of the importance of being honest.
36. The order will be reviewed before its expiry. At the review hearing, the Committee may revoke the order, it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.
37. This will be confirmed to Miss Thomas in writing in accordance with the Act.
38. That concludes this hearing.