

**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing**

18 – 19 March 2026

Name: RIZVI, Nida Fatima
Registration number: 243779
Case number: CAS-211468-W0J6C4

General Dental Council: Joe O'Leary, Counsel
Instructed by IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Represented by Julia Furley, Counsel
Instructed by JFH Law

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of caution

Outcome: Reprimand

Committee members: Clive Powell (Chair, lay member)
Caroline Ross (Dental Care Professional member)
Suki Sandhar (Dentist member)

Legal adviser: Kenneth Hamer

Committee Secretary: Sara Page

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

2. This is a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing. The members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, conducted the hybrid hearing at the General Dental Council's (GDC) London offices located at 37 Wimpole Street, London for 18 March 2026. The remainder of the hearing was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams.
3. You were present at the hearing and represented by Ms Julia Furley, Counsel, instructed by the JFH Law.
4. Mr Joe O'Leary, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

Preliminary matters

Decision and reasons for the hearing to be held in private

5. At the beginning of the hearing, the Committee made a decision pursuant to Rule 53 of the 'General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006' ('the Rules') that this hearing be held in private.
6. The defence, by way of a written application dated 13 March 2026, sought to have part of the substantive hearing heard in private.
7. The Committee noted that this case references third parties and to conduct the hearing in public session may lead to the identification of those third parties. It also noted that the documentation and the evidence provided refers to a number of sensitive matters relating to your private and family life.
8. 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 and having regard to the information before it, the Committee was satisfied that the personal interests of the third parties and their right to anonymity outweighed the public interest in this case. In addition, the Committee was satisfied your personal interests outweighed the public interest relating to the matters referring to your private and family life.
9. In considering the practical difficulties in hearing parts of the hearing in private, and the subsequent determination, the Committee determined that the entirety of the hearing should be conducted in private session to minimise the possibility of the third parties being identified in this case.

Application to amend the charges

10. Mr O'Leary made a further application to amend the charge pursuant to Rule 18. He applied to remove the words '*at Pendleton Police Station in Greater Manchester*' and to insert the words '*Greater Manchester*'. It was submitted that the amendment simply corrects the location of where you were cautioned as, whilst you were interviewed at Pendleton Police station, the conditional caution at indicates that the caution was in fact administered at Stretford Police Station.

11. Mr O'Leary also indicated that a typographical error has resulted in the absence of the word 'the' from charge 1)a) and applied to insert this, as follows:

'That being registered as a dentist:

- 1) *On 13th August 2024 at ~~Pendleton Police Station in Greater Manchester~~, you were cautioned by the Greater Manchester Police for the following offences.*
 - a) *Assault occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, contrary to s47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, against Person A...*

12. Mr O'Leary made a further application to correct the names of the persons named in Schedule A. In relation to the applications, Mr O'Leary submitted that allowing the amendments as proposed would cause you no injustice as:

- a) There is no requirement in the charge for the location of the caution to be set out;
- b) In any event the location of the caution is not relevant to the facts that the committee are discussing, the amendment is purely stylistic in nature;
- c) The change to the names within the Schedule of Anonymity have no consequence for you;
- d) You have been told in advance of the hearing of the GDC's intention to amend the charge; and,
- e) There is no change in the way the GDC puts its case.

13. The applications, as proposed by Mr O'Leary, were supported by Ms Furley.

14. Having carefully considered the application on behalf of the GDC, the Committee was satisfied that having regard to the merits of the case and the fairness of the proceedings, the required amendments could be made without injustice and therefore acceded to the applications, as proposed.

Finding of facts

Charges

15. The charges being considered by the Committee, as detailed in the Notice of Hearing, dated 3 February 2026, are as follows:

'That being registered as a dentist:

- 1) *On 13th August 2024, you were cautioned by the Greater Manchester police for the following offences:*
 - a) *Assault occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, contrary to s47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, against Person A*
 - b) *Assault occasioning Actual Bodily Harm, Contrary to s47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, against Person B*

And that, by reason of the matters alleged above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your Caution.'

Admissions

16. At the outset of the hearing, Ms Furley, on your behalf, informed the Committee that you made full admissions to Charge 1).
17. Having noted the admissions, the Committee had regard to the certificates of conditional caution, dated 12 August 2024. The Committee accepted this document as conclusive proof of your police caution.
18. Having satisfied itself that there are no factual disputes between the basis of your admissions and the way the GDC is presenting the case, the Committee concluded that your admissions were clear and unambiguous and further evidence was not required in order to explore the facts.
19. Accordingly, the Committee accepted your admissions and found Charge 1) proved.

Fitness to practise and sanction

20. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee then moved on to consider whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your caution.
21. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to both impairment and sanction, and had regard to the GDC document, '*Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (6 January 2026)*', referred to as the 'FtP Guidance'.

Background and summary of the GDC's case

22. On 15 May 2024, the GDC received a webform complaint from Greater Manchester Police stating that the police had been made aware, [PRIVATE] of the suspected assault of Person B.
23. [PRIVATE].
24. You were interviewed by the police on 13 May and 26 July 2024. On both occasions you were represented by a solicitor, was given 'pre-interview disclosure' and were cautioned.
25. [PRIVATE].
26. [PRIVATE].
27. On the 13 August 2024, the police confirmed with the GDC you had been conditionally cautioned, and you were described as being extremely cooperative with the police investigation. showing great remorse for your actions.
28. [PRIVATE].

Evidence

29. The Committee had regard to a number of documents included within the GDC hearing bundle, referred to as Exhibit 1. This bundle included, but was not limited to, the following documents:

- Conditional caution, signed and dated 12 August 2024;
- Transcript of police interviews, dated 13 May and 26 July 2024;
- Your personal statement, dated 13 March 2026;
- Your curriculum vitae (CV); [PRIVATE].

30. The Committee also heard oral evidence from you under affirmation.

Submissions

31. Mr O’Leary, on behalf of the GDC, invited the Committee to find that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on the ground of public interest alone. He referred the Committee to the ‘test’ and submitted that your caution demonstrates that your fitness to practise is impaired as you have brought your profession into disrepute and have breached fundamental tenets of the dental profession. He invited the Committee to consider the GDC document, ‘*Standards for the Dental Team (September 2013)*’ and submitted that Standards 9.1 and 9.1.1 are relevant in this case.
32. [PRIVATE]. Given the police caution, Mr O’Leary submitted that were a finding of impairment not made, the public would be shocked that police intervention and a caution resulted in no action from a regulatory body. In its consideration of the risk of repetition, Mr O’Leary invited the Committee to consider your personal reflection and the level of training you have undertaken. Whilst he accepted that you have demonstrated that you have thought about the allegations, he submitted that nonetheless your fitness to practise remains impaired on the ground of public interest.
33. In relation to sanction, Mr O’Leary invited the Committee to consider the warning given to you by the Case Examiner’s in 2023, following reports of clinical and behavioural concerns. He submitted that the appropriate outcome in this case is the imposition of a suspension order for a period of three to six months, without a review. He referred to a number of mitigating and aggravating factors for the Committee to consider and informed the Committee that you have fully complied and cooperated with the investigation, promptly reporting the matter to the GDC. He cited that it is not the GDC’s case that there is a harmful deep-seated personality issue and therefore erasure would be wholly disproportionate in this case.
34. [PRIVATE]. In considering current impairment, Ms Furley invited the Committee to take into account the difficult personal circumstances you faced [PRIVATE].
35. [PRIVATE], Ms Furley submitted that, [PRIVATE] the public interest would not be offended by a finding of no impairment.
36. However, if the Committee were to make a finding of current impairment, Ms Furley submitted that the suspension as proposed by the GDC, would undo all of the amazing steps you have taken to get your life back on track. [PRIVATE].
37. In relation to your previous warning by the GDC, Ms Furley pointed out that the allegations were denied and there was no finding made against you, and that the concerns raised related to different issues to those under consideration by the Committee.

Decision and reasons on impairment

38. The Committee considered whether the conduct that led to your police cautions are remediable, whether it had been remediated, and whether it can be said that it is highly unlikely to be repeated.

39. The Committee also had regard to the wider public interest, which includes the need to uphold and declare proper standards of conduct and behaviour to maintain public confidence in the profession and this regulatory process.
40. In assessing current impairment on the ground of public protection, the Committee considered whether you have demonstrated insight and remorse, any remedial action taken by you and any risk of recurrence. [PRIVATE].
41. [PRIVATE].
42. As well as demonstrating genuine remorse for your actions through your written statement and in your oral evidence before the Committee, the Committee also took into account that you have taken remedial steps to mitigate against the risk previously shown. [PRIVATE]. In addition, you have undertaken various Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses in order to address your shortcomings. Further, you have provided evidence of substantial self-reflection and insight into your conduct, [PRIVATE].
43. You were able to satisfy the Committee that you have a genuine understanding of the severity of your conduct and indicated the support systems you have in place to prevent such conduct occurring again in the future. Whilst the incident could not be considered to be isolated, there is no suggestion that such conduct has since been repeated and there is no evidence before the Committee of similar conduct at any other time or involving other people or patients. As a result of the considerable remorse and substantial insight you have demonstrated, the Committee considered the risk of repetition to be negligible .
44. Therefore, the Committee determined that a finding of current impairment is not required on the ground of public protection.
45. In relation to the public interest, the Committee bore in mind that there is an overriding need to declare and uphold proper standard of conduct and behaviour in the profession. You stated in your oral evidence that you hold a position of privilege as a dental professional and that members of the public would look up to you and accepted that your conduct would be considered unacceptable by the public, regardless of your personal circumstances. Whilst the Committee determined that it is highly unlikely that your conduct would be repeated in the future, this is case where there has been a serious failure to meet the standards required of a dental professional, [PRIVATE].
46. In this regard, the Committee determined that a finding of impairment on the ground of public interest is required in order to recognise the seriousness of the conduct for which you readily accepted a caution.

Decision and reasons on sanction

47. In coming to its decision on sanction, the Committee considered what action, if any, to take in relation to your registration. It took into account the FtP Guidance. The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate and appropriate and, although not intended to be punitive, may have that effect.
48. The Committee took into account the following mitigating features:
- [PRIVATE];
 - Evidence of remorse, insight and apology;
 - Remedial action taken, [PRIVATE];

- That you undertook voluntary undertakings with the NHS at the time of the incident; and,
 - Complied fully with bail conditions.
49. The Committee also took into account the following aggravating feature:
- [PRIVATE],
 - Your adverse fitness to practise history with the GDC.
50. In its consideration of the type of sanction to impose, the Committee had regard to its previous findings on misconduct and impairment in coming to its decision and considered each sanction in ascending order of severity.
51. The Committee first considered whether to issue a reprimand and noted paragraphs 262 and 263 of the FtP Guidance, namely that a reprimand may be suitable where there is no evidence that the dental professional poses a risk to the public, has shown insight into their failings, has expressed genuine remorse, and taken rehabilitative and/or corrective steps to mitigate against any future risk.
52. The Committee acknowledged the submissions of Mr O’Leary that you received a warning from the Case Examiners in 2023 in relation to clinical concerns, including behavioural issues. Having carefully considered the evidence before it, the Committee noted that [PRIVATE] the concerns outlined were not connected to the conduct that resulted in the police cautions.
53. In ascending the scale of possible sanctions, the Committee determined that this is not a case suitable for conditional registration.
54. The Committee therefore considered whether a suspension would be suitable in the circumstances and referred to paragraph 272 of the FtP Guidance. Having already determined that you have shown insight, demonstrated a negligible risk of repetition and pose no real risk of harm to the public, the Committee further determined that based on the information before it and the oral evidence presented today, there was no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems that would warrant removal, albeit temporarily, from the Register.
55. [PRIVATE].
56. The Committee was mindful that, at the end of the day, its duty is to have regard to the GDC’s overarching objective the Dentists Act 1984 and to promote and maintain public confidence in the profession and uphold proper professional standards and conduct.
57. In all the circumstances the Committee determined that to issue a reprimand was sufficient to mark the seriousness of the conduct related to your police caution. A reprimand meets the public interest considerations to maintain trust and confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards. The Committee was satisfied that a reasonable informed observer, fully aware of the facts of the case, would consider that the sanction of a reprimand represents a suitable and proportionate disposal and that a suspension order would be disproportionate in the unique circumstances of this case.
58. A reprimand will be recorded against your name in the Register. The fact of this reprimand, and a copy of this 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.



59. This will be confirmed to you in writing in accordance with the Act.
60. That concludes this determination.

PUBLIC