

**PRIVATE HEARING**

**Professional Conduct Committee  
Review Hearing**

**22 June 2026**

**Name:** PRICE, Lynn  
**Registration number:** 153277  
**Case number:** CAS-197298-J8W5G6

---

**General Dental Council:** Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel  
Instructed by Amy Jones, IHLPS  
**Registrant:** Not present  
Unrepresented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of conviction, misconduct and adverse health  
**Outcome:** Suspended indefinitely

---

**Committee members:** Debbie Jones (Chair, Dental Care Professional member)  
Gill Jones (Dentist member)  
Helen Eatherton (Lay member)  
**Legal adviser:** Trevor Jones  
**Committee Secretary:** Sara Page

1. 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.
- 

2. 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.
3. Miss Price was not present at the hearing and was unrepresented.
4. Ms Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

### **Preliminary matters**

#### **Application for the hearing to be held partly in private**

5. At the beginning of the hearing, Ms Bagott, on behalf of the GDC, made an application under Rule 53 of the *'General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006'* ('the Rules') that this hearing be held partly in private since the matters under consideration include reference to Miss Price's health.
6. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, due to the nature of the matters in this case, the Committee was satisfied that the personal interests of Miss Price outweighed the public interest in this case.
7. Therefore, the Committee was satisfied that the hearing should be held in private when discussing matters relating to Miss Price's health and acceded to Ms Bagott's application.
8. The Committee therefore determined that the hearing should be held partly in private, and directed that two versions of the determination be made available, with appropriate redactions made to the restricted version that is made available to the public upon request.

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

9. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Price was neither present nor represented at today's hearing.
10. In her absence, the Committee first considered whether the Notice of Hearing ('the Notice') had been served on Miss Price in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the *'General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006'* ('the Rules').
11. The Committee had regard to the indexed hearing bundle of 64 pages, which contained a copy of the Notice, dated 11 May 2026. The Notice was sent to Miss Price's registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post on 11 May 2026, in accordance with Section 50A of the *'Dentists Act 1984' (as amended)* ('the Act') and via email on the same date.
12. 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 that the Committee has the power to proceed with the hearing in Miss Price's absence.

13. 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 Price's registered address on 13 May 2026. It was signed for against the printed name of 'LYNN'.
14. In light of the information available, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Price has been served with proper notification of this hearing, with at least 28 days' notice, in accordance with the Rules.

### **Decision and reasons on whether to proceed in the absence of Miss Price**

15. Ms Bagott made an application to proceed in the absence of Miss Price. She referred the Committee to the information contained within the bundle demonstrating numerous attempts made by the GDC to contact Miss Price, including telephone attendance notes and emails [PRIVATE]. Ms Bagott submitted that as there has been no response received from any of those attempts and no engagement by Miss Price in relation to today's hearing, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.
16. The Committee carefully considered whether to exercise its discretion to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Price and any representative on her behalf. The Committee was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of Miss Price 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.
17. The Committee bore in mind that today's hearing has been arranged as there is a statutory requirement for the substantive order to be reviewed prior to its expiry. It noted that there has been no engagement from Miss Price and no application for an adjournment. In light of her non-engagement, there was no information before the Committee to demonstrate that adjourning would secure her attendance at a later date.
18. On the basis of the information before it, the Committee concluded that Miss Price had voluntarily absented herself from today's hearing.
19. In all these circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Price.

### **Background**

20. This hearing was convened to review the current suspension order, which is due to expire on 24 July 2026.
21. This is the third review of a substantive suspension order initially imposed by the Professional Conduct Committee ('the initial PCC') in June 2023. Miss Price did not attend that hearing nor was she represented. That initial PCC considered allegations against her brought by the GDC.
22. The initial PCC found a number of allegations against Miss Price proved including:
  - *She was convicted on 02 August 2017 at Merseyside Magistrates Court of driving a motor vehicle with alcohol in excess of the prescribed limit, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.*
  - *From 21 May 2021 until on or about 14 July 2021 Miss Price failed to respond to the General Dental Council's letter of 07 May 2021 which required Miss Price*

*to provide specified information, including proof of indemnity arrangements, employment details [PRIVATE].*

- *From 21 May 2021 until on or about 14 July 2021 Miss Price failed to cooperate with an investigation conducted by the General Dental Council [PRIVATE].*
- *From 02 August 2017 until on or about 22 April 2021 Miss Price did not inform her then employer of her criminal conviction, and that her conduct was misleading and was dishonest.*
- *Miss Price provided false information to her former employer regarding her continued employment in dentistry, by stating that she had declined a role at a new employer, when in fact Miss Price had accepted employment with them. Her conduct in this regard was misleading and was dishonest.*
- *Miss Price was suffering from an adverse health condition [PRIVATE].*

23. The initial PCC found that Miss Price's actions in her failure to co-operate with the GDC's investigation into concerns about her health, failure to inform her employer of her criminal conviction and providing false information to her former employer, regarding her continued employment in dentistry amounted to misconduct. It determined that Miss Price's behaviour had fallen far short of the standards of conduct that were proper in the circumstances.

24. The initial PCC determined that Miss Price's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her misconduct, conviction and adverse health. The initial PCC noted the absence of any evidence from Miss Price in relation to her current circumstances, her remorse and/or any steps she had taken to prevent recurrence in relation to the misconduct and conviction. There was no current information in relation to Miss Price's management of her adverse health condition.

25. The initial PCC imposed a suspension order for a period of 12 months and directed a review prior to the expiry of the 12-month period.

26. Miss Price's case was reviewed on the following occasions:

- 12 June 2024 (Suspension order extended for 12 months); and,
- 19 June 2025 (Suspension order extended for 12 months).

27. At the last review, the previous PCC found that Miss Price's fitness to practise remained impaired and stated:

*'The Committee noted that Miss Price has not engaged with the GDC over the past two years. Consequently, there is no material change in position since the last review hearing in June 2024. There remains an absence of information in respect of Miss Price's insight and remediation into the concerns raised and therefore a risk of repetition.*

*In respect of Miss Price's misconduct, there is no evidence of her demonstrating an understanding of the importance of engaging fully with her regulatory body and the impact of being able to carry out its regulatory functions to protect the public, nor of her understanding of the impact of her dishonesty on the public and the profession.*

*Turning to Miss Price's conviction dated 2 August 2017 for driving a motor vehicle on 11 July 2017 with alcohol in excess of the prescribed limit, there is no evidence of insight or remediation in relation to the circumstances of that incident and the impact of her drink driving offence on public confidence in the profession.*

*Lastly, in respect of Miss Price's health, [PRIVATE], the Committee has concluded that Miss Price's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her adverse health condition, [PRIVATE].*

28. The previous PCC directed that the suspension order imposed on Miss Price's registration be extended for a period of 12 months with a review, stating:

*'...the Committee took into account that there has been no material change of circumstances since the initial hearing. Miss Price has continued not to engage with the fitness to practise proceedings. It is satisfied that an extension of the current suspension order is necessary to protect the public.'*

### **Submissions**

29. Ms Bagott, on behalf of the GDC, invited the Committee to impose an indefinite suspension order upon Miss Price's registration. She submitted that the Committee must undertake a fresh review of this case and consider whether Miss Price's fitness to practise is currently impaired and whilst it is not bound by any previous decisions in this regard, previous reasons may serve as a starting point to determine whether her fitness to practise remains impaired.
30. Ms Bagott reminded the Committee that the persuasive burden lies with Miss Price to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired and took the Committee through the powers available to it at this stage. She told the Committee that Miss Price has not engaged with the GDC and has not demonstrated any insight, reflection or remediation into the misconduct found proved and that her fitness to practise remains impaired on this basis. [PRIVATE]. Therefore, Ms Bagott submitted that Miss Price has failed to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of adverse health.
31. In relation to the August 2017 conviction for drink driving, Ms Bagott submitted that Miss Price has failed to demonstrate any insight or remediation for the conduct that led to the conviction and that there remains a risk to the public should she be permitted to return to unrestricted practise. Further, Ms Bagott submitted that the public's confidence in the profession would be undermined as Miss Price has failed to engage with the GDC since 2023 and there is no evidence before the Committee that she has attempted to address the matters found proved.
32. In this regard, Ms Bagott submitted that Miss Price has been unable to discharge her persuasive burden that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired and that as a result, her fitness to practise remains impaired on both grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest.
33. When considering sanction, Ms Bagott invited the Committee to find that as there has been no evidence of reflection, insight, or remediation in this case, Miss Price poses a significant risk of repetition, and the public confidence would be undermined if anything less than a suspension was imposed in this case. However, she submitted that as Miss Price has now been subject to a suspension order for almost three consecutive years, which is due to expire in less than two months, she invited the Committee to impose indefinite suspension. She submitted that this would be appropriate and proportionate in this case as Miss Price has ceased to engage with the GDC, is not actively seeking to remediate her previous deficiencies and whilst previous PCCs have concluded that her misconduct was remediable and not fundamentally incompatible with ongoing registration, Miss Price has failed to engage with the GDC since 2023 and there

has been no material change since the imposition of the order that would warrant a further extension of the current order.

34. Miss Price has not provided any written submissions for consideration by the Committee for the purposes of today's review.

#### **Decision and reasons on impairment**

35. The Committee considered whether Miss Price's 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.
36. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
37. In deciding whether Miss Price's fitness to practise remains impaired, the Committee took into account that the findings made against Miss Price included a conviction for drink driving, misconduct and adverse health. Miss Price has not responded to any notification of today's proceedings, nor has she engaged with any attempt made by the GDC to contact her since the imposition of the suspension order in June 2023. As a result, Miss Price has failed to demonstrate any insight into her failings or conduct, no reflection or evidence of remediation of the conduct that led to the findings and as a result, the Committee concluded that the risk of repetition of similar conduct remains high. The Committee noted that Miss Price [PRIVATE] has not provided any evidence that she has insight into her adverse health or that she is addressing her health matters [PRIVATE].
38. Therefore, the Committee concluded that Miss Price has failed to discharge the burden of proof that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of her conviction, misconduct or adverse health. This presents a real risk of harm to the public were Miss Price to be permitted to return to practise without restriction.
39. In addition, the Committee determined that public confidence in the profession and the GDC as its regulator would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in a case where a registrant had failed to engage with their regulator, failed to demonstrate any insight or remediation into their conduct or adverse health, [PRIVATE].
40. As a result of all the above, the Committee concluded that Miss Price's fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of both public protection and in the wider public interest.

#### **Decision and reasons on sanction**

41. 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.
42. The Committee was aware that it should have regard to the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against Miss Price's own 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.

43. The Committee determined that due to the nature of the matters in this case and the lack of engagement, conditional registration would not be appropriate and would not be proportionate to address the risk identified.
44. In light of this, the Committee carefully considered whether to extend the current suspension order for a further period. However, Miss Price has ceased to engage with the GDC and has not actively sought to demonstrate any remediation any deficiencies previously identified. Further, there is no evidence before the Committee that Miss Price has addressed her adverse health. The Committee accepted the findings of previous PCCs that the misconduct and conviction, though serious, did not require removal from the Register given that there was no suggestion of deep-seated attitudinal behaviour on the part of Miss Price. They were potentially remediable [PRIVATE]. However, the Committee noted that almost three years have elapsed since the suspension order was initially imposed and that there has been no material change during that time that would demonstrate that a further period of suspension would be appropriate in the circumstances.
45. Accordingly, the Committee determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is one of indefinite suspension.
46. Miss Price may request a review of the indefinite suspension two years after 24 July 2026, which is the date upon which this order will take effect.
47. This will be confirmed to Miss Price in writing in accordance with the Act.
48. That concludes this determination.