

PRIVATE HEARING

Health Committee Review Hearing

20 May 2026

Name: NEGWER, Frank Dieter Bernhard Karl

Registration number: 81639

Case number: CAS-205934-F0V7D1

General Dental Council: Abimbola Johnson, Counsel.
Instructed by Naila Hadid, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct and health

Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)

Duration: Nine months

Committee members: Helen Wagner (Lay) (Chair)
Gill Jones (Dentist)
Rachel McCoubrey (Dental Care Professional)

Legal adviser: Lucia Whittle-Martin

Committee Secretary: Andrew Keeling

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

1. This was a review hearing pursuant to Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing was for this Health Committee (HC)

to review Mr Negwer's case and determine what action to take in relation to his registration.

2. Mr Negwer did not attend the hearing and was not represented. Miss Abimbola Johnson, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

Preliminary Matters

3. As Mr Negwer did not attend the hearing, the Committee first considered the issues of service and whether to proceed with the hearing in his absence. The Committee heard submissions from Miss Johnson. It heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.

Decision on Service of the Notice of Hearing

4. The Committee considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Mr Negwer in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the GDC's Fitness to Practise Rules 2006 ('the Rules') and Section 50A of the Act. The Committee received from the GDC an indexed hearing bundle, which contained a copy of the Notice of Hearing ('the notice'), dated 16 April 2026, thereby complying with the 28-day notice period. The hearing bundle also contained a Royal Mail '*Track and Trace*' receipt confirming that the notice was sent to Mr Negwer's registered address by Special Delivery. A copy of the notice was also sent by first class post and emailed to Mr Negwer on 16 April 2026.
5. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Mr Negwer contained proper notification of today's hearing, including its time, date and that it will be conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams, and the other prescribed information including notification that the Committee had the power to proceed with the hearing in Mr Negwer's absence.
6. On the basis of the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that notice of the hearing had been served on Mr Negwer in accordance with the Rules and the Act.

Decision on Proceeding in the Registrant's Absence

7. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 of the Rules to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Negwer. The Committee approached the issue of proceeding in absence with the utmost care and caution. It took into account the factors to be considered in reaching its decision, as set out in the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5* and *GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. It remained mindful of the need to be fair to both Mr Negwer and the GDC, taking into account the public interest and Mr Negwer's own interests in the expeditious review of the suspension order imposed.

8. The Committee first concluded that all reasonable efforts had been taken to send the notification of hearing to Mr Negwer in accordance with the Rules. It took into account that there has been no response from Mr Negwer to the notice and that he has a history of non-engagement with the GDC. The Committee concluded that adjourning the hearing would not secure Mr Negwer's future attendance and that Mr Negwer had voluntarily absented himself from the hearing. The Committee was also mindful that the substantive order of suspension is due to expire on 31 May 2026.
9. In those circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Negwer.

Application for hearing to be held in private

10. At the beginning of the hearing, Miss Johnson made an application for the hearing to take place entirely in private pursuant to Rule 53(1) and (2). Miss Johnson submitted that this would be appropriate as the matters in the case were inextricably linked to Mr Negwer's health. She also submitted that the substantive hearing took place in private.
11. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.
12. The starting point for the Committee is for all hearings to be held in public as it is in the interests of justice to do so. However, a hearing may be held in private where it concerns matters that are inextricably linked to the health or private and family life of the Registrant concerned, under Rule 53(2). The Committee agreed that as the matters in this case involve Mr Negwer's health, it would be appropriate for the hearing to be held entirely in private. The Committee therefore acceded to the application.

Background

13. Mr Negwer's case was first considered by a HC at a hearing that took place between 27 and 29 October 2025. Mr Negwer did not attend this hearing and was not represented.
14. At that hearing, the HC found proved that Mr Negwer was suffering from adverse health conditions, [PRIVATE]. It also found proved that Mr Negwer had failed to cooperate with the GDC's investigation into his fitness to practise from 31 January 2024 until at least 11 May 2024.
15. That Committee also determined that Mr Negwer's failure to comply with the GDC's investigation over a period of some three and a half months was serious and amounted to misconduct.
16. In respect of whether Mr Negwer's fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of his adverse health, that Committee determined the following:

44. [PRIVATE]

45. [PRIVATE]

46. [PRIVATE.]

47. In all the circumstances, the Committee determined that a finding of impairment on the grounds of adverse health is necessary in this case for the protection of the public.

48. The Committee also concluded that public confidence in the dental profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made. In its view, a fully informed member of the public, aware of all the facts, would be concerned if Mr Negwer were permitted to practise unrestricted. Accordingly, the Committee is satisfied that a finding of impairment is also required in the wider public interest.

49. The Committee therefore determined that Mr Negwer's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of his adverse health.'

17. In respect of whether Mr Negwer's fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of his misconduct, it determined as follows:

'50. The Committee has had regard to its finding that Mr Negwer failed to co-operate with the GDC's investigation from 31 January 2024 until at least 11 May 2024 is serious. Whilst it notes that its finding relates to these dates, the Committee has borne in mind that Mr Negwer has continued to not engage with the GDC between September and October 2025 in relation to his attendance at this hearing as well as his failure to respond to the GDC's requests for information in relation to his fitness to practise.

51. [PRIVATE.]

52. The Committee has concluded that public confidence in the dental profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment on the grounds of misconduct were not made given Mr Negwer's lack of engagement with the GDC. Accordingly, the Committee is satisfied that a finding of impairment is required in the wider public interest.'

18. In respect of sanction, that Committee determined to impose a suspension order on Mr Negwer's registration for a period of six months. It considered this to be proportionate in all the circumstances to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the dental profession. That Committee also considered that this period would be sufficient to allow Mr Negwer to start engaging with the GDC.

19. That Committee also considered there should be a review hearing before the expiry of the order and that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by receiving the following:

- Evidence of Mr Negwer's engagement with the GDC.
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].

Today's Review

20. This Committee has comprehensively reviewed Mr Negwer's case today. In doing so, it has considered all the evidence presented to it. It has taken account of the submissions of Miss Johnson, on behalf of the GDC, and the documentary evidence. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

21. Miss Johnson took the Committee through the background to the case. She submitted that since the initial hearing, the GDC has attempted to contact Mr Negwer on numerous occasions [PRIVATE]. However, there has been no response from Mr Negwer and therefore there is no evidence about the current status of his health. She also submitted that the substantive Committee had identified that Mr Negwer had shown no insight into his misconduct and that his failure to co-operate with the GDC's investigation amounted to a serious departure from the GDC's Standards. She submitted that there was a continuing risk of serious harm to the public arising from Mr Negwer's adverse health and misconduct.

22. Miss Johnson invited the Committee to extend the suspension on Mr Negwer's registration for a period between nine to 12 months.

Decision on Impairment

23. In making its decision, the Committee first sought to determine whether Mr Negwer's fitness to practise is still impaired by reason of his adverse health and misconduct. It exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decision of the previous committee. It balanced Mr Negwer's needs with those of the public and bore in mind that its primary duty is to protect the public, including by maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour. The Committee had regard to the GDC's guidance document, *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees'* (effective from 6 January 2026).

24. The Committee noted that there is no evidence that Mr Negwer has engaged with the GDC. Since the conclusion of the substantive hearing, the GDC had attempted to contact Mr Negwer on several occasions, [PRIVATE]. Mr Negwer was also advised by the previous Committee to engage with these proceedings and [PRIVATE]. The Committee therefore concluded that Mr Negwer's fitness to practise is currently impaired on public protection grounds by reason of his health conditions.

25. In relation to the public interest, the Committee concluded that, in the absence of any evidence of remediation and insight from Mr Negwer in relation to either his health conditions or past misconduct, public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made on public interest grounds.

Committee's Decision on Sanction

26. The Committee next considered what sanction should be imposed on Mr Negwer's registration. It bore in mind the need to protect patients and the public interest. The Committee once again had regard to the principle of proportionality, weighing the interests of the public with Mr Negwer's own interests.

27. The Committee found that Mr Negwer's fitness to practise remains impaired. In these circumstances, the Committee concluded that terminating the current suspension order would not be appropriate or sufficient for the protection of the public. The Committee was also satisfied that imposing conditions would not be workable owing to Mr Negwer's continuing non-engagement with these proceedings. The Committee therefore directed that Mr Negwer's current period of suspension should be extended for a period of nine months, with a review hearing before the expiry of the order. The Committee was satisfied that this was sufficient and proportionate given that Mr Negwer has provided no evidence about the current status of his health and as there has been no co-operation from him since the completion of the substantive hearing in October 2025.

28. The Committee also wished to re-iterate the recommendation of the substantive Committee in that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by receiving the following:

- Evidence of Mr Negwer's engagement with the GDC.
- [PRIVATE].
- [PRIVATE].

29. Mr Negwer has 28 days, from the date that notice is deemed to have been served upon him to appeal this Committee's direction. Unless Mr Negwer exercises his right of appeal, the current suspension order on his registration will be extended by a period of nine months from the date that the current order would otherwise expire. In the event that Mr Negwer exercises his right of appeal, the current suspension order will remain in force until the resolution of the appeal.

30. That concludes this hearing.