

PUBLIC HEARING**Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing****16 October 2025****Name:** CARACUEL SANZ, Margarita**Registration number:** 230807**Case number:** CAS-200964

General Dental Council: Represented by Laura Stockdale, counsel
Instructed by Eileen McMahon, IHLPS**Registrant:** Present
Represented by Chris Gillespie, counsel
Instructed by Samuel Birrell, MDDUS

Fitness to practise: No longer impaired.**Outcome:** Conditions revoked

Committee members: David Wood (Chair, Lay member)
Robin Barber (Dentist member)
Kristy Cardis (DCP member)**Legal Adviser:** Edward Hosking**Committee Secretary:** Paul Carson

Miss Caracuel Sanz,

1. This is a resumed hearing of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) pursuant to section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984. The hearing is being conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams.
2. On 15 August 2024, the initial PCC found your fitness to practise as a dentist to be impaired by reason of misconduct and directed that your registration be suspended for a period of six months with a review.
3. The initial PCC had found that you failed to provide an adequate standard of care to a patient, who was referred to as Patient 1, on 19 November 2019, in that:
 - The extraction of LL8 was not clinically justified;
 - You did not carry out sufficient pre-treatment assessments;
 - You did not conduct proper treatment planning;
 - You did not discuss the full risks and benefits of the proposed treatment;
 - You did not discuss any other treatment options;
 - You did not gain informed consent for the extraction of LL8;
 - You failed to make arrangements for Patient 1 to be referred to a suitably qualified clinician for the extraction of LL8;
 - You did not ensure the appropriate equipment and/or materials were available prior to commencing the extraction;
 - You did not remove the mesial root of LL8;
 - You damaged Patient 1's hard palate;
 - You damaged the inferior alveolar nerve;
 - You did not prescribe any post-operative medication at the time of Patient 1 leaving the surgery.
4. The initial PCC also found proved that on 4 November 2019, you failed to inform Patient 1 of the likelihood that the inferior alveolar nerve had been damaged and failed to immediately refer Patient 1 to a specialist setting for a second opinion and/or treatment.
5. It was further found proved that between 1 November 2019 and 17 December 2019, you failed to maintain an adequate standard of records keeping in respect of Patient 1's appointments, in that:
 - You did not record any discussion of the risks and benefits of the treatment;
 - You did not record any discussions with regards to other treatment options;
 - You did not clinically justify, grade or report the radiographs taken;
 - You did not make any record of the medications prescribed; and
 - You did not record that the mesial root of LL8 was left in situ on 1 November 2019.
6. The initial PCC determined that these matters amounted to misconduct and that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of that misconduct on public protection

and wider public interest grounds. The Committee also found that such a finding of impairment was required in the wider public interest. The initial PCC determined that the appropriate sanction to impose was one of suspension for a period of six months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of the period of suspended registration.

7. The PCC reviewed the suspension on 21 January 2025 and directed that it be replaced with a period of conditional registration for 9 months with a review.
8. In finding that your fitness to practise continued to be impaired, the January 2025 PCC stated:

“...The Committee finds that you have produced a considerable amount of information to demonstrate that you have insight into the misconduct that was previously found, and that you have taken some steps to remedy that misconduct. Your witness statement, in particular, sets out your considered reflections on the matters that have given rise to these proceedings. The Committee finds that you have the required degree of insight into your misconduct. However, the Committee considers that this information is not sufficient for it to be able to conclude that you have remedied in full the shortcomings that have been identified in your practice. The Committee notes in particular that the CPD that you have provided in your remediation bundle, whilst targeted, has only recently been undertaken. Accordingly, there has not been sufficient time for that learning to be embedded into your practice. The Committee is also mindful that there does not appear to be any independent verification of the work that you have been undertaking, with particular regard to the small number of extractions that from your logs you appear to have performed. In the circumstances the Committee is not able to conclude that a repeat of your misconduct is highly unlikely. The Committee has therefore determined that the public remains at continued risk of harm if no restrictions were in place on your registration, and that your fitness to practise remains impaired.

The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is also, and again, required in the wider public interest in order to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession.”

9. The conditions imposed by the January 2025 PCC included conditions preventing you from carrying out extractions “*unless directly observed by a GDC registered dentist*” and requiring you to carry out an audit of any such extractions.

The resumed hearing 16 October 2025

10. It is role of the Committee today to undertake the review directed by the January 2025 PCC.
11. The Committee had regard to all the material put before it, including your updated Continuing Professional Development (CPD) record and your records of the total of three extractions which you had undertaken in Spain since January 2025, where you

currently work 2-3 clinical sessions of 8 hours each per week. You also provided a reference from another dentist with whom you have worked. You are yet to resume practice in the United Kingdom and do not have any intention of doing so in the foreseeable future. You had only undertaken a total of three extractions since the last review hearing as you refer most extractions to another practitioner. The extractions which you did undertake were carried out without supervision as the conditions imposed on your registration do not apply whilst you are practising outside of the GDC's regulatory jurisdiction.

12. You did not give oral evidence to the Committee today.

13. Miss Stockdale, for the GDC, submitted that the evidence does not show that the concerns of the January 2025 PCC have been fully addressed and that the conditions on your registration should therefore be extended by a further period of 12 months with a review. She submitted that the further CPD which you have undertaken is recent and is yet to be fully embedded and that the three extractions which you had undertaken were unsupervised and that the corresponding detailed patient records which you have provided are therefore unsigned by a supervisor. Miss Stockdale further submitted that the testimonial on which you seek to rely is not recent, as the dentist had only worked with you from 2013-16 and is therefore of limited relevance.

14. Mr Gillespie, on your behalf, submitted that any risk to the public has now been mitigated to an extent where it would be disproportionate to continue the conditions. He submitted that the conditions should now be revoked.

Decision

15. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

16. The Committee first considered whether your fitness to practise continues to be impaired by reason of the misconduct found by the initial PCC.

17. The Committee attached limited weight to the testimonial on which you seek to rely, as it is not recent and in any event only refers to a period of practice between 2013-16.

18. The Committee had regard to your CPD record. Your current CPD activity was undertaken only relatively recently. However, it was targeted CPD with detailed reflective writing on your learning against each activity. The Committee examined your earlier CPD records as a whole and concluded that you have consistently undertaken relevant learning activities over an extended period. This is not a case where you have completed CPD at the "last minute" as a performative step for the purposes of a review hearing. The evidence as a whole shows genuine targeted learning and reflection. Whilst the few extractions which you have undertaken were not supervised, the corresponding patient records, albeit unverified through any supervisory process, are detailed and do not show any area of concern. In the Committee's judgment, the 2-3 clinical sessions per week of approximately 8 hours per week which you are undertaking reflects a significant clinical workload which is consistent with the working pattern of many dentists. The Committee therefore

rejected Miss Stockdale's submission that these 2-3 clinical sessions per week reflect relatively limited clinical work at this stage of your remediation.

19. Having regard to all the circumstances, including the isolated and historic nature of the index event some six years ago, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired. There is evidence of sufficient remediation before the Committee with no evidence of any further concerns. The risk of repetition is low in the Committee's judgment. There is therefore no longer a risk to the public in allowing you to resume practise unrestricted. The wider public interest has already been met through the declaratory effect of the finding of impairment at the initial hearing and the sanctions which have already been imposed.
20. Accordingly, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise as a dentist is no longer impaired. The Committee therefore directs that the conditions on your registration be terminated forthwith.
21. That concludes the case.