

HEARING PART- HELD IN PRIVATE
Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing

5 January 2026

Name: EMAMI, Nariman
Registration number: 175607
Case number: CAS-206247-C4X7M7

General Dental Council: Ms Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel
Instructed by IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)
Duration: 9 months

Committee members: Clive Powell (Chair, Lay Member)
Janhvi Amin (Dentist Member)
Lisa Shaw (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal adviser: Suzanne Palmer

Committee Secretary: Jenny Hazell

Mr Emami,

1. The purpose of this Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing is to carry out a statutory review of an order suspending your registration. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). It is being held remotely via Microsoft Teams.
2. You are representing yourself at these proceedings. Ms Bagott, Counsel, appears on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC).

Factual background

3. Ms Bagott set out the factual background to your case. In April 2025 the PCC considered allegations against you relating to your conduct. You attended the hearing but you were not represented. The PCC found proved, by way of your admissions, all of the factual allegations, namely that:

- You failed to respond adequately to Person A's complaint about Person B's dental treatment.
- You failed to have appropriate insurance or indemnity insurance in place from 27 January 2019 to 30 April 2019 and from 1 May 2020 until 31 July 2020.
- You failed to co-operate with an investigation conducted by the GDC from 14 September 2022 until at least 16 May 2023.
- You failed to maintain an up to date registered address from at least April 2021 until 4 March 2025.

4. At the PCC hearing in April 2025 you accepted the shortcomings identified in the GDC's case. You recognised the importance of having a current and up to date registered address. You explained that when you were in the UK you co-operated with the GDC as fast as you could and all the time. You apologised for what happened and stated that this would not happen again in future. In respect of maintaining a registered address with the GDC which, you said, was the address of a friend. You stated that you had not viewed this as a problem, until your discussions with the GDC as part of this hearing, given that your friend had passed all your correspondence to you. You said that you believed that your registered address with the GDC had to be a UK address. You also highlighted that you had kept the same email address and phone number.

5. The PCC first considered your failure to respond to Person A's complaint about Person B's dental treatment. It considered that you had had ample opportunity to respond to Dental Complaints Service (DCS) and/or directly to the patient, but you did not do so. Whilst it noted your evidence that you had made some contact with the GDC in respect of the matter, it was not satisfied that there was any evidence before it of an adequate response to Person A's complaint.

6. The PCC considered that your failure to ensure that you had indemnity during the periods in question represented a serious and fundamental departure from the expected standards, given the serious risk of unwarranted harm to patients. The PCC further took into account that there were two separate periods during which you did not hold indemnity, which demonstrates a repeated failure.

7. The PCC was satisfied that your failure to engage with the GDC's investigation from 14 September 2022 to 16 May 2023 amounted to a serious falling short of what was expected in the circumstances. In the PCC's view, you had numerous opportunities over the period in question to engage with the GDC's investigation, but failed to do so, even though you could have easily communicated from Germany.

8. Finally, the PCC had regard to your failure to maintain a correct and up to date registered address from at least April 2021 to 4 March 2025. It took into account your evidence that receiving

correspondence from the GDC was made easier by your friend, who was able to forward all your post. The PCC considered that it was not difficult to change your registered address, yet you neglected to do so over a lengthy period. The PCC was satisfied that this was a serious breach of the expected standards.

9. The PCC was satisfied that the facts admitted and found proved, both individually and cumulatively, amounted to misconduct.

10. The PCC considered that your misconduct was of a serious nature, involving your lack of meaningful engagement over a sustained period of time with a patient complaint and an investigation conducted by the GDC. There is also your repeated failure to have professional indemnity in place. The PCC acknowledged your difficult personal circumstances around the time. It noted from your oral evidence that you are aware of what you should have done and what you might do differently if faced with similar circumstances in the future. This indicated to the PCC an element of self-reflection. However, the PCC considered your insight to be in the very early stages and was not reassured that it has been embedded into your behaviour.

11. In all the circumstances, given the very early stage of your insight and the absence of any targeted remediation, the PCC was not satisfied that you fully appreciated the gravity of your misconduct. It therefore concluded that there is a risk of repetition which could give rise to a risk of harm. Accordingly, the PCC determined that a finding of current impairment was necessary in this case for the protection of the public. It also determined that a finding of current impairment is in the wider public interest. It concluded that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of your misconduct.

12. In considering what sanction, if any, to impose on your registration, the PCC bore in mind the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests. It also had regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors in this case.

13. The PCC took into account that you had demonstrated remorse and some insight to the extent that you understand that you were wrong to have neglected your professional obligations, and that there is a need to address your misconduct. It therefore determined that it was appropriate and proportionate to impose a suspension order on your registration for the protection of the public and to uphold the wider public interest. The suspension order was imposed for a period of 9 months. The PCC also determined to direct a review given that your insight was currently at a very early stage, and given the identified need for remediation.

14. The PCC indicated that it might be helpful for the reviewing Committee to receive the following from you:

- Evidence of your continued engagement with the GDC and this process, including that you have maintained a current and up to date registered address.
- If you have continued to practise outside of the UK, and if required, evidence of your professional indemnity/insurance.
- A written reflective piece in relation to all the issues in this case.
- Any evidence of relevant courses you have undertaken (e.g. Complaints Handling, Communication Skills, Administrative skills).
- Testimonials, including from professional colleagues.

15. The PCC was also satisfied that an immediate order was required in light of the findings against you.

Today's review hearing

16. This is the first review hearing. In reviewing the suspension order today, the Committee has considered the information contained in the GDC's review bundle, which includes emails between the GDC's Case Review Team and you between April 2025 and December 2025, with reminders of the PCC's recommendations. The Committee also had regard to your oral evidence which you gave under oath. It took account of the submissions made by Ms Bagott on behalf of the GDC as well as your own oral representations. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

17. In your evidence you explained you have not been working as a dentist in the United Kingdom or in Germany. However, it is your intention to resume to work as a dentist in Germany in or around February/March 2026. You anticipate that you will be able to obtain supportive testimonials once you resume practice in Germany. You also explained that you would like to return to the United Kingdom to work as a dentist.

18. You informed the Committee that since the initial PCC hearing in April 2025 you have provided the GDC with your updated registered address in Germany. In respect of indemnity you explained that you have not been working as a dentist in the United Kingdom and therefore do not currently have any indemnity arrangements in place. However, in Germany the arrangements for indemnity are different in that they are automatically organised through the provider. You explained that you undertook some self-education in respect of how to deal with dental complaints via accessing websites from various dental organisations such as the GDC and the British Dental Association. However, you accepted that there were no certificates to confirm the learning activities you have undertaken. You also set out some of the personal difficulties you have been going through in the last three years.

19. Ms Bagott reminded the Committee that at this review hearing, the persuasive burden is on you to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired. She invited the Committee to find that your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct. She submitted that you have not provided any evidence of remediation or reflection, as required by the initial PCC hearing in April 2025. The GDC's position is that the concerns that were identified by that PCC in April 2025, both in relation to the protection of the public and the wider public interest, remain. She submitted that the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is that your registration be suspended for a further period of 9 months. This would enable you to demonstrate the necessary level of insight and to show that the changes in your practice have been embedded into your practice over a sustained period of time.

20. You accepted that you were not in a position to provide the information required by the PCC in April 2025 and therefore you did not seek to argue that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired. You further accepted that you would be able to provide the necessary information once you have returned to clinical practice in Germany in February/March 2026 and submitted that 6 months' suspension would allow you sufficient time to do so.

Decision on current impairment

21. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct. In doing so, it exercised its independent judgement. 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.

22. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to its powers and the principles which should guide its approach. The Committee had regard to the GDC's Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance (October 2016, updated December 2020) ("the Guidance").

23. The Committee took into account that the PCC in April 2025 set out in detail the information that the reviewing Committee would find helpful to receive. It is encouraged by your engagement with the GDC as well as the fact that you have maintained a current and up to date registered address. In addition, the Committee recognises that you have undertaken some on-line self-study in relation to complaints handling. However, the Committee has not been provided with any documentary evidence in the form of certificates of completion to confirm the studying that you have undertaken in the three areas identified by the previous PCC. Furthermore, although you were asked to provide this Committee with a written reflective piece, you did not do so. Finally, there was no evidence of testimonials from professional colleagues. The Committee considers that you had ample time in which to provide this information over the last 9 months but you have not done so, despite repeated requests by the GDC.

24. Given these substantial gaps in the evidence, the Committee cannot safely conclude that the risk of repetition is so low that no action needs to be taken to protect the public. Accordingly, the Committee determined that a finding of impairment on the grounds of misconduct is necessary for the protection of the public. The Committee is further satisfied that a finding of current impairment on the grounds of the wider public interest is necessary to uphold and declare proper standards of conduct and behaviour, given the lack of evidence of any remediation. Accordingly, the Committee has concluded that your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of misconduct.

Sanction

25. The Committee next considered what direction to give in accordance with Section 27C of the Act, and whether it would be appropriate to terminate the suspension, or to replace the suspension with a direction of conditional registration.

26. The Committee considered that terminating the suspension would not be sufficient to protect the public or meet the public interest considerations referred to above.

27. The Committee next considered whether it could formulate conditions which would be workable and which would address the ongoing risks. The Committee has borne in mind your limited attempts to remediate the deficiencies in this case. It concluded that conditions would not be sufficient or workable to meet the public protection and public interest considerations in this case.

28. The Committee then considered whether it would be appropriate to extend the current period of suspension. You indicated that you did not oppose this course of action but invited the Committee to extending the order for 6 months instead of the 9 months proposed by the GDC. The Committee has borne in mind your limited attempts to remediate the deficiencies in this case and that very little has changed since the initial hearing in April 2025. The Committee considers that 6 months will be insufficient time for you to demonstrate that the changes in your practice have been embedded fully in your approach to your clinical practice. It is satisfied that a further period of 9 months suspended registration is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose to protect the public and the public interest.

29. The Committee hereby directs that your registration be suspended for a further period of 9 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. This direction will take effect from the date on which the existing period of suspension would otherwise expire.

30. Although the Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the future reviewing Committee which will review your suspension prior to its expiry, it considers that the future reviewing Committee may be assisted by the following:

- Your attendance at the review hearing
- If you have continued to practise outside of the UK, and if required, evidence of your professional indemnity/insurance.
- A written reflective piece in relation to all the issues in this case.
- Any evidence of relevant courses you have undertaken (e.g. Complaints Handling, Communication Skills, Administrative skills).
- Testimonials, including from professional colleagues.

31. These documents must be provided to the GDC within 28 days in advance of the review hearing.

32. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, your registration will be suspended for a further period of 9 months. That extension will take effect on the date on which it would otherwise expire, that is to say on 2 February 2026. Should you decide to appeal, the existing direction of suspension will remain in force until the resolution of any such appeal.

33. That concludes this case for today.