

PRIVATE HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

The factual inquiry: 2-3 March 2026
Stage two: 5 March 2026

Name: CHAHID, Hoda
Registration number: 308679
Case number: CAS-204362-J9M1V2

General Dental Council: Thomas Buxton of Counsel
Instructed by Amy Jones of IHLPS

Registrant: Not present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct
and adverse physical or mental health

Outcome: Suspension with a review

Duration: 6 months

Immediate order: Immediate order of suspension

Committee members: Carson Black (Chair) (Dentist)
Emili Shatchan (DCP)
Catherine Pease (Lay)

Legal adviser: Angus Macpherson

Committee Secretary: Paul Carson

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

1. The General Dental Council (GDC) alleges that Miss Chahid's fitness to practise as a dental nurse is currently impaired by reason of both misconduct and adverse physical or mental health.

Service and absence

2. Miss Chahid was neither present nor represented at this hearing, which was conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams. Mr Buxton, on behalf of the GDC, submitted that notification of this hearing had been served on her in accordance with the requirements of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the 'Rules') and that the hearing should proceed notwithstanding her absence.
3. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on the requirements of service and proceeding in absence.
4. The notification of hearing was sent to Miss Chahid at her registered address on 29 January 2026 by both first class post and Special Delivery. A link to download a copy of the notification of hearing was also sent to her by email on the same day. Tracking information provided by Royal Mail shows that the Special Delivery item was delivered on 30 January 2026.
5. The Committee was satisfied that the notification of hearing contained the required information under Rule 35 of the Rules, including, the time, date and (remote) venue of this hearing; and that it had been served on Miss Chahid in accordance with the requirements of Rule 65 by virtue of its being posted to her registered address.
6. The next consideration for the Committee was whether to proceed in the absence of Miss Chahid. This is a discretion which must be exercised with great care and caution.
7. The Committee was satisfied that the GDC had made all reasonable efforts to send notice of this hearing to her.
8. In September 2025, Miss Chahid wrote to the GDC to request voluntary removal from the DCP register. She had no longer worked in clinical dentistry since at least July 2024.
9. On 10 February 2026, Jovi Gomes, a paralegal at the GDC, emailed Miss Chahid a link to download the proposed bundle for use at this hearing, stating: '*...I should be grateful if you would please provide me with any observations/comments/further documents you would like to provide, by **close of business Tuesday, 17 February 2026.***' Miss Chahid replied later that day to state: '*I have nothing new to add for the committee to view.*'
10. On 16 February 2026, Mr Gomes emailed Miss Chahid to ask her to confirm whether or not she intended to attend this hearing. She replied later that day to state: '*I will not be attending as I have nothing more which I feel I can add to this case.*'

11. The Committee was therefore satisfied that Miss Chahid is aware of this hearing and its purpose and had confirmed in writing that she does not intend to attend the hearing. In those circumstances, the Committee determined that she had voluntarily absented herself (as is her right) and that adjourning or postponing the hearing would not make her attendance any more likely at a future date. Having regard to all the circumstances, including Miss Chahid's stated position and the need for the expeditious disposal of proceedings, the Committee determined that it would be fair and in the public interest to proceed notwithstanding her absence.

Private hearing under Rule 53 of the Rules

12. Mr Buxton then applied for the hearing to be held partly in private under Rule 53 of the Rules in relation to Miss Chahid's alleged adverse physical or mental health. He submitted that the hearing should remain in public in relation to the misconduct allegations.

13. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on the principle of open justice and the scope of Rule 53 of the Rules.

14. The Committee agreed with Mr Buxton's submission that it is necessary to hold the hearing in private to protect Miss Chahid's right to privacy in relation to her alleged adverse physical or mental health. However, the Committee rejected his submission that the misconduct allegations are distinguishable and should remain in public.

15. In the Committee's judgment, the misconduct allegations are inextricably linked to the adverse physical or mental health which the GDC alleges against Miss Chahid. If the misconduct allegations were to be heard in public, it would disproportionately compromise her right to privacy in relation to her alleged adverse physical or mental health. Further, it would be impractical to move between public and private session when hearing evidence and submissions on both these aspects of the case. The Committee therefore determined that the entire hearing should be held in private in accordance with the Rule 53 of the Rules.

[16-59 IN PRIVATE]

60. On 3 March 2026, the Committee found charges 1(a), 2 and 3 proved. On 5 March 2026, the Committee determined that Miss Chahid's fitness to practise as a Dental Nurse is currently impaired by reason of misconduct and adverse physical or mental health and directed that her registration be suspended for a period of six months with a review.

61. The Committee now invites submissions on the question of an immediate order.

62. The interim order on Miss Chahid's registration is hereby revoked.

63. Mr Buxton applied for an immediate order of suspension to be made under section 36U(1) of the Dentists Act 1984.

64. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on immediate orders.

65. The Committee determined that an immediate order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. It would be inconsistent with the determination the Committee has reached not to make an immediate order.
66. The effect of this order is that Miss Chahid's registration shall be immediately suspended upon notification of this decision being served on her. Unless she exercises her right of appeal, the substantive 6 month period of suspension shall take effect upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period.
67. Should she exercise her right of appeal, this immediate order shall remain in force pending the disposal of the appeal.
68. That concludes this determination.