

HEARING PART-HELD IN PRIVATE

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

20, 21 and 23 January 2026

Name: YOUNG-HIND, Philippa Elizabeth
Registration number: 285143
Case number: CAS-210785

General Dental Council: Callum Munday, counsel
Instructed by Georgina Mayles, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Not represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of conviction and misconduct

Outcome: Fitness to Practise Impaired. Reprimand Issued

Duration: N/A

Immediate order: N/A

Committee members: Martin Isherwood (Dental Care Professional) (Chair)
Annika Hindocha (Dentist)
Jane Jones (Lay)

Legal adviser: Melanie Swinnerton

Committee Secretary: Gareth Llewellyn

At this hearing the Committee made a determination that includes some private information. That information has been omitted from this public version of the determination and the document marked to show where private material has been removed.

Determination on preliminary matters – 20 January 2026

Ms Young-Hind

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being held remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice.
2. You are present and are not represented. Callum Munday of counsel, instructed by Georgina Mayles of the General Dental Council's (GDC's) In-House Legal Presentation Service (IHLPS), appears for the GDC.

The charge

3. The charge that you face at this hearing, as amended, reads as follows:

'That being a registered dental care professional

1. [withdrawn].
2. *On 04/07/2019, you signed in the application form for registration with the General Dental Council and ticked the box "No" in response to the question: "Have you been convicted of a criminal offence and/or cautioned and/or are you currently subject to any police investigations which might lead to a conviction or caution in the UK or any other country?".*
3. *On 26/07/2019, you were convicted at Cleveland Magistrates' Court of three counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker on 10/07/2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.*
4. *On 08/08/2019, you failed to notify the General Dental Council that you had been convicted as set out at head of charge 3 above.*
5. *Your conduct in relation to 4 was:*
 - a) *Misleading*
 - b) *Dishonest*

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

Amendment to charge

4. At the outset of the hearing Mr Munday on behalf of the GDC applied to amend heads of charge 1, 3, 4 and 5 pursuant to Rule 18 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). Those heads of charge originally appeared as follows:
 1. *On 26/11/2014 you received a conditional discharge at Hartlepool Magistrates Court*

for being drunk and disorderly on 14/11/2014 contrary to s.91(1) of the Criminal Justice Act 1967.

3. *On 26/07/2019, you were convicted at Cleveland Magistrates Court of three counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker on 10/07/2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967.*
4. *You failed to notify the General Dental Council that you were subject to criminal proceedings in relation to three counts of “assault by beating of an emergency worker” on 10 July 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.*
5. *Your conduct in relation to 2 and 4 was:*
 - a. *Misleading*
 - b. *Dishonest*
5. Mr Munday applied to withdraw head of charge 1, to correct the references to the relevant Acts at heads of charge 3 and 4, to refer to your criminal conviction at head of charge 4, and to withdraw the reference to head of charge 2 at head of charge 5. You did not object to Mr Munday’s application. The Committee, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, determined to accede to the applications on the basis that it was fair and appropriate for the amendments to be made, and that no injustice would be caused to you. In so doing the Committee decided to simplify the wording at head of charge 4. Mr Munday and you made no objection to that further amendment. The schedule of charge was duly amended, and is set out above at paragraph 3.

Hearing to be part-held in private

6. Mr Munday invited the Committee to hold part of the hearing in private in accordance with Rule 53 of the Rules where matters relating to your private life are mentioned. You supported the application. The Committee, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, determined to accede to the application for the purposes of protecting your private life. The hearing then proceeded partly in private.

Admissions

7. You tendered admissions to some of the heads of charge that you face. The heads of charge that you admitted were, namely, 2, 3 and 4. The Committee, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, determined and announced that the facts alleged at those heads of charge were proven on the basis of your admissions in accordance with Rule 17 (4) of the Rules.

Findings of fact – 21 January 2026

Background to the case and summary of allegations

8. The allegations giving rise to this hearing relate to, and arise out of, your criminal conviction for three offences of assault by beating.
9. The Committee has found that on 26 July 2019 you were convicted at Cleveland Magistrates’ Court of three counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker on 10/07/2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018. The Committee notes from the evidence presented to it that the emergency workers in question were three police officers who had attended at your home address in response to a complaint that they had received.

10. The Committee has also found that, approximately a fortnight later on 8 August 2019, when applying for registration with the GDC as a dental nurse, you failed to disclose this conviction. For the purposes of your application you relied in part on the application form that you had originally signed and dated on 4 July 2019, on which you had stated that you had not been convicted of a criminal offence. The GDC had returned that form to you and had asked you to supply further information. You then resent that same form when you resubmitted your application for registration, with additional supporting information, to the GDC the following month. The GDC alleges that your failure to disclose this conviction was misleading and dishonest.

Evidence

11. The Committee has been provided with documentary material in relation to the heads of charge that you face, including the Memoranda of Conviction relating to the court appearance referred to above; information from Cleveland Police in relation to the offences for which you were convicted; the witness statement and documentary exhibits of a registration manager with the GDC, namely Chelsea Norton, who has knowledge of your application for registration with the GDC; a witness statement and documentary exhibits from a GDC caseworker, namely Sadaf Rasul, who has knowledge of the GDC’s investigation of these matters; and your written observations on the heads of charge that you face.
12. The Committee heard oral evidence from you.

Committee’s findings of fact

13. The Committee has taken into account all the evidence presented to it, both written and oral. It has considered the submissions made by Mr Munday on behalf of the GDC and those made by you. The Committee has had regard to the GDC’s *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026).
14. The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee is mindful that the burden of proof lies with the GDC, and has considered the heads of charge against the civil standard of proof, that is to say, the balance of probabilities. The Committee has considered each head and sub-head of charge separately, although some of its findings will be announced together.
15. I will now announce the Committee’s findings in relation to each head of charge:

1.	[withdrawn]
2.	<p><i>On 04/07/2019, you signed in the application form for registration with the General Dental Council and ticked the box “No” in response to the question: “Have you been convicted of a criminal offence and/or cautioned and/or are you currently subject to any police investigations which might lead to a conviction or caution in the UK or any other country?”.</i></p> <p>Admitted and proved</p>
3.	<p><i>On 26/07/2019, you were convicted at Cleveland Magistrates’ Court of three counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker on 10/07/2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.</i></p> <p>Admitted and proved</p>

4.	<p><i>On 08/08/2019, you failed to notify the General Dental Council that you had been convicted as set out at head of charge 3 above.</i></p> <p>Admitted and proved</p>
5.	<p><i>Your conduct in relation to 4 was:</i></p>
5. (a)	<p><i>Misleading</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-head of charge 5 (a) proved.</p> <p>The Committee considers that your failure to notify the GDC of your conviction when applying for registration on 8 August 2019 was, objectively, misleading. The Committee considers that the GDC was led to believe that you had not been convicted, when in fact that you had been convicted.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-head of charge 5 (a) proved.</p>
5. (b)	<p><i>Dishonest</i></p> <p>Not proved</p>
	<p>In approaching this sub-head of charge the Committee applied the test set out in <i>Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd. t/a Crockfords</i> [2017] UKSC 67. The test is that the Committee must decide subjectively the actual state of an individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts, and must then apply the objective standards of ordinary and decent people to determine whether the individual's conduct was dishonest by those standards.</p> <p>The Committee had regard to the oral and written evidence that you provided.</p> <p>IN PRIVATE</p> <p>[text omitted]</p> <p>IN PUBLIC</p> <p>The Committee considers that the GDC has not demonstrated to the standard required that you deliberately omitted to declare your criminal conviction as part of your application for registration. The Committee accepts your evidence that, when resubmitting your application form on or around 8 August 2019, you did not give proper consideration to the continued accuracy of the original application form of 4 July 2019. Whilst the Committee notes that you did correct a postal code on the first page of that form, the Committee accepts as plausible and credible your evidence that you did not give proper thought to the criminal conviction declaration that appeared on a subsequent page.</p> <p>The Committee accepts your account that your state of mind at the time was to focus on the additional information that the GDC had requested, and that your attention was on those further supplementary information rather than on the previously-completed application form. The Committee also accepts your</p>

	<p>evidence that the fact that the conviction was recent, relating as it did to your court appearance around a fortnight beforehand, did not mean that it was at the forefront of your mind when you submitted the additionally-requested information, together with your original application.</p> <p>IN PRIVATE</p> <p>[text omitted]</p> <p>IN PUBLIC</p> <p>For these reasons, the Committee finds that the GDC has not adduced sufficient evidence to prove that your failure to disclose your criminal conviction was dishonest. Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 5 (b) not proved.</p>
--	---

16. We move to stage two.

Determination on misconduct, impairment and sanction – 23 January 2026

17. Following the handing down of the Committee’s findings of fact on 21 January 2026, the hearing proceeded to stage two; that is to say, misconduct, impairment and sanction.

Proceedings at stage two

18. The Committee has considered all the evidence presented to it, both oral and written. It has taken into account the submissions made by Mr Munday on behalf of the GDC and the information provided by you. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC’s *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

Evidence at stage two

19. The Committee received further written evidence from you, namely your personal reflective statement and two testimonial letters from professional colleagues, namely the principal dentist and practice manager at your current place of work.

20. In your personal reflective statement you apologised for your conduct in 2019, which you described as ‘*out of character*’, and ‘*an isolated incident which will not happen again*’. You stated that you recognise that informing the GDC ‘*should have been my first priority, for which I am truly sorry*’. You referred again to your personal circumstances at the relevant times as summarised in the Committee’s earlier factual determination. You stated that you put patients’ needs first, that you do not consider that you pose a risk to patients or colleagues, and that you are currently working to good effect in your present role.

21. The Committee heard oral evidence from your practice manager, who adopted her testimonial letter.

Summary of submissions

22. Mr Munday on behalf of the GDC submitted that the facts that the Committee has found proved at heads of charge 4 and 5 (a) amount to misconduct. Mr Munday submitted that a finding of impairment is required in the public interest. Mr Munday submitted that, were the

Committee to make a finding of impairment, a sanction of a reprimand might represent a suitable disposal of this case.

23. You made no oral submissions.

Fitness to practise history

24. Mr Munday addressed the Committee in accordance with Rule 20 (1) (a) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). Mr Munday submitted that you have no fitness to practise history with the GDC.

Misconduct

25. The Committee first considered whether the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 2, 4 and 5 (a) constitute misconduct. For the avoidance of doubt, the Committee did not consider head of charge 3 as part of its deliberations on the question of misconduct, as that head of charge concerns a criminal conviction which might give rise to a finding of impairment on the grounds of conviction, rather than on the grounds of misconduct

26. In considering this and all other matters, the Committee has exercised its own independent judgement. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the following paragraphs of the GDC's *Standards for the Dental Team* (September 2013) in place at the time of the incidents giving rise to the facts that the Committee has found proved. These paragraphs state that as a dental care professional you must:

9.3 Inform the GDC if you are subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against you anywhere in the world.

9.3.1 You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world. See our guidance on reporting criminal proceedings for more information.

27. The Committee considers that the facts that it has found proved at head of charge 2 do not amount to misconduct, relating as they do to anodyne, background narrative facts which do not go towards the issue of misconduct.

28. The facts that the Committee has found proved at heads of charge 4 and 5 (a) arise out of your criminal conviction for three offences of assault by beating.

29. On 26 July 2019 you were convicted at Cleveland Magistrates' Court of three counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker. The emergency workers in question were three police officers who had attended at your home address in response to a complaint that they had received. The Committee found at heads of charge 4 and 5 (a) that you failed to disclose this conviction to the GDC when applying for registration, and that your conduct was misleading.

30. In light of the findings of fact that it has made, the Committee has determined that the proven facts at heads of charge 4 and 5 (a) amount to misconduct. The Committee considers that misleading the GDC is a serious matter, as it meant that the GDC was not able to take appropriate, prompt and well-informed decisions about your fitness to practise. This may have affected the integrity of the register upon which the safety and wellbeing of the public, and the public's trust and confidence in the profession, is dependent. The Committee considers that your conduct was a serious falling short of the standards reasonably to be expected of a registered dental care professional.

31. The Committee has therefore determined that the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 4 and 5 (a) amount to misconduct.

Impairment

32. The Committee next considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found, or your conviction, or both. In doing so, the Committee again exercised its own independent judgement.
33. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has borne in mind that its overarching objective is to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

BY REASON OF MISCONDUCT

34. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found in respect of heads of charge 4 and 5 (a).
35. The Committee notes that you have expressed an apology for your failure to disclose your conviction to the GDC, and that you have expressed some insight into your conduct. Although the Committee considers that you do not fully understand the wider consequences for the protection of the public and the wider public interest, you do now appear to recognise the importance of disclosing relevant information to the GDC. In this regard the Committee took account of the extensive admissions that you made at the outset of the hearing to the facts that the Committee went on to find proved. The Committee notes that the incident giving rise to these proceedings was isolated, and took place a number of years ago. The Committee has taken account of the information that you provided in relation to the change in your personal circumstances as referred to in the Committee's previous factual determination. In its judgement this further lowers the risk of you repeating your misconduct. The Committee notes that you have made changes in your approach to these matters, including your disclosing your criminal record to your current employer. The Committee has heard that you have the confidence of that employer. In the circumstances, the Committee is satisfied that you would now act differently, and that a repeat of your misconduct is highly unlikely. The Committee therefore considers that you no longer pose a risk to the public.
36. However, the Committee considers that a finding of impairment is, nonetheless, required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. The Committee considers that engaging with the regulator is a fundamental tenet of the profession, and that your conduct, in behaving in a misleading manner by failing to declare your criminal conviction, brought the reputation of the profession into disrepute. In the Committee's judgement the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the nature of your misconduct. Accordingly, the Committee finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct on public interest grounds.

BY REASON OF CONVICTION

37. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your criminal conviction as found at head of charge 3.
38. The Committee found at that head of charge that on 26 July 2019 you were convicted at Cleveland Magistrates' Court of three counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker. The emergency workers in question were three police officers who had attended at your home address in response to a complaint that they had received.

39. The Committee considers that the offences of which you were convicted were serious, relating as they do to acts of violence towards police officers who were undertaking their public protection duties. The Committee notes that you have served the terms of the sentence arising from your conviction, and that the offences of which you were convicted took place some years ago. However, the Committee again considers that a finding of impairment is required to mark the seriousness of your conviction, to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. The Committee considers that the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made in light of the serious nature of your conviction. Accordingly, the Committee finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction on public interest grounds.

Sanction

40. The Committee then determined what sanction, if any, is appropriate in light of the findings of facts, misconduct and impairment that it has made. The Committee recognises that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have such an effect, but is instead imposed to protect patients and safeguard the wider public interests mentioned above.
41. In reaching its decision the Committee has again taken into account the GDC's *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026). The Committee has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests. The Committee has once more exercised its own independent judgement.
42. The Committee has taken account of the testimonials submitted on your behalf as referred to above. The Committee understands that the authors of those testimonials are aware of the nature of the allegations that you have faced, and are similarly aware that their testimonials would be provided to this Committee. The Committee also notes that the testimonials are recent.
43. The Committee has paid careful regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors present in this case.
44. In respect of the mitigating factors that are present, the Committee notes that the incident giving rise to these proceedings was isolated, and that it occurred a considerable amount of time ago. The Committee notes that you have shown regret and remorse for, insight into, and remediation of, your conduct. It understands that you have practised without reported incident since the events in question, and that you have no fitness to practise history with the GDC. The Committee has also taken account of your difficult personal circumstances at the time, as referred to in its previous factual determination.
45. In terms of aggravating factors, the Committee notes that your offending behaviour caused harm to the police officers who attended, and that your failure to disclose your conviction to the GDC constitutes a breach of trust between you and the GDC and entails a reckless disregard for the role of the regulator.
46. The Committee has considered the range of sanctions available to it, starting with the least restrictive. In the light of its findings, the Committee considers that taking no action would not be sufficient in the particular circumstances of this case. In the Committee's judgement public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be significantly undermined if no action were taken.
47. The Committee next considered whether it would be appropriate to conclude the case with a reprimand. After careful consideration the Committee has concluded that it would be

appropriate and proportionate to issue a reprimand. The Committee has found that you do not pose a risk to the public, that you have shown remorse for, insight into and remediation of your misconduct. Whilst the Committee recognises the seriousness of your misconduct and conviction, it took into account the personal circumstances to which you have referred, as summarised in the Committee's previous factual determination. The Committee has heard that, some years later, those circumstances have changed in a positive way. The Committee notes that these positive changes are attested to by the supportive testimonials submitted on your behalf by the principal dentist and practice manager at your current place of work. The Committee also again took account of the absence of fitness to practise history. In all the circumstances, the Committee considers that a reprimand is sufficient to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour, and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession.

48. The Committee did consider whether a higher sanction such as a period of conditional or suspended registration would be appropriate. It considered that no higher sanction than that of reprimand is needed in order to address the public interest considerations referred to above.
49. This reprimand, and a copy of the public determination, will appear alongside your name in the Register for a period of 12 months. The reprimand forms part of your fitness to practise history and is disclosable to prospective employers and prospective registrars in other jurisdictions.
50. That concludes this case.