

HEARING HELD IN PUBLIC**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing****10 to 12 November 2025****Name:** HORRI, Elena**Registration number:** 291568**Case number:** CAS-203258

General Dental Council: Tom Phillips, counsel
Instructed by Sarah Atkinson, Kingsley Napley solicitors**Registrant:** Not present
Not represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct**Outcome:** Suspended with immediate suspension (with a review)**Duration:** 12 months**Immediate order:** Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Elizabeth Rantzen (Lay) (Chair)
Angela Wragg (Dental Care Professional)
Jake West (Dentist)**Legal adviser:** Tanveer Rakhim**Committee Secretary:** Gareth Llewellyn

Determination on preliminary matters – 10 November 2025

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being held remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice.
2. Ms Horri is not present and is not represented in her absence. Tom Phillips of counsel, instructed by Sarah Atkinson of Kingsley Napley solicitors, appears for the General Dental Council (GDC).

The charge

3. The charge, as amended, that Ms Horri faces at this hearing reads as follows:

Being registered as a dentist with the General Dental Council Ms Elena Horri (73897):

1. *On 15 March 2022 failed to maintain adequate standards of decontamination in that:*
 - a. *You directed Colleague A*, a Dental Nurse, to not clean potentially contaminated dental instruments before sterilisation; and /or*
 - b. *You directed Colleague A, a Dental Nurse, to not clean potentially contaminated hand pieces before sterilisation.*
2. *On 15 March 2022 failed to maintain adequate standards of cross-infection control in that:*
 - a. *You brought a potentially contaminated flat plastic instrument into contact with a container of composite; and*
 - b. *You intended to use the composite within the container on another patient.*
3. *On or before 15 March 2022 failed to adequately check Colleague A's suitability to work as a Dental Nurse, before engaging her to work as a locum Dental Nurse in that:*
 - a. *You did not obtain proof of Colleague A's identity;*
 - b. *You did not obtain documentary evidence that she was appropriately registered with the GDC;*
 - c. *You did not obtain documentary evidence of her qualifications;*
 - d. *You did not obtain a full employment history with explanations for gaps in employment;*
 - e. *You did not obtain evidence of a Disclosure and Barring Scheme check.*
4. *On or after 14 March 2022 failed to treat Colleague A fairly, in that you engaged her services as a locum Dental Nurse on 15 March 2022, and did not remunerate her as agreed or at all for the services she provided on 15 March 2022.*
5. *On or after 2 September 2022 you failed to comply with a Court Order issued by the Central London County Court, which required you to remunerate Colleague A for services provided to you during the course of your professional work.*
6. *On 2 September 2022 failed to communicate with Colleague A in a professional manner in that:*
 - a. *You sent two photographs to Colleague A via SMS message;*
 - b. *The photographs were sent in response to the court order Colleague A obtained against you; and*
 - c. *In this context, the photographs were intimidating / threatening and /or offensive.*
7. *Your conduct as described in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 put patient safety at risk.*

AND that by reason of the matter(s) set out above your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Service of notice of hearing

4. On behalf of the GDC Mr Phillips submitted that service of notice of this hearing has been properly effected in accordance with Rules 13 and 65 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). On 7 October 2025 a notice of hearing was sent to the address that Ms Horri has registered with the GDC, setting out the date and time of this hearing, as well as the fact that the hearing would be conducted remotely. The notice was sent using the Royal Mail's International Tracked and Signed delivery service. The Royal Mail's Track and Trace service records that the notice was delivered on 15 October 2025. A copy of the notice was also sent by email to Ms Horri's two known email addresses on 8 October 2025.
5. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee determined that service of the notice of this hearing has been properly effected in accordance with the Rules.

Proceeding in absence

6. The Committee then went on to consider whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in the absence of Ms Horri in accordance with Rule 54 of the Rules.
7. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee was mindful that its discretion to conduct a hearing in the absence of a registrant should be exercised with the utmost care and caution. After careful consideration the Committee determined that it would be fair and appropriate to proceed in Ms Horri's absence. The Committee determined that Ms Horri has voluntarily absented herself from this hearing, and that an adjournment, which has not been requested, would be unlikely to secure her attendance. The Committee noted that Ms Horri has not responded to the notice of hearing, or to the GDC's requests for her to confirm her attendance. The Committee was also mindful of the potential inconvenience that would be caused to the GDC and its witnesses were it not to proceed. The Committee also took into consideration the public interest in the expeditious consideration of this case.

Amendment to charge

8. Mr Phillips then applied to amend head of charge 4 pursuant to Rule 18 of the Rules in order to make the head of charge clearer. The Committee also stated that it had identified typographical errors at head of charge 5, and Mr Phillips then applied to amend that further head of charge. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee considered that the amendments are minor and do not alter the substance of the case, and nor would there be any unfairness to Ms Horri in making these changes. The Committee determined to accede to the applications on the basis that it was fair and appropriate for the amendments to be made. The schedule of charge was duly amended.

Findings of fact – 11 November 2025**Background to the case and summary of allegations**

9. The allegations giving rise to this hearing relate to three aspects of Ms Horri's practice as a dentist. First, her standards of decontamination and cross-infection. Second, her employment practices towards another registrant, who is referred to for the purposes of these proceedings as Colleague A. Third, her conduct towards Colleague A. Ms Horri engaged the services of Colleague A on 15 March 2022 in the capacity of a locum dental nurse.

DECONTAMINATION AND CROSS-INFECTION

10. It is alleged that, on 15 March 2022, Ms Horri failed to maintain adequate standards of decontamination, in that she directed Colleague A to not clean potentially contaminated dental instruments and hand pieces before sterilisation. It is also alleged that, on that same day, Ms Horri failed to maintain adequate standards of cross-infection control, in that she brought a potentially contaminated flat plastic instrument into contact with a container of composite, and intended to use the composite on another patient. The GDC contends that these failures put patient safety at risk.

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

11. It is alleged that, prior to engaging Colleague A's services as a locum dental nurse on 15 March 2022, Ms Horri failed to undertake adequate checks of Colleague A's suitability to work as a dental nurse, including checking her GDC registration and identity. The GDC contends that these failures put patient safety at risk.
12. It is further alleged that Ms Horri failed to treat Colleague A fairly, in that she did not remunerate her as agreed or at all for the work that she provided on 15 March 2022. Ms Horri also faces an allegation that she failed to comply with a court order issued by the Central London County Court which required her to remunerate Colleague A for the work that she had done.

CONDUCT TOWARDS COLLEAGUE A

13. The GDC alleges that on 2 September 2022 Ms Horri failed to communicate with Colleague A in a professional manner, in that she sent two photographs to Colleague A via mobile phone short messaging service (SMS) in response to the court order referred to in the previous paragraph, and which were intimidating, threatening and/or offensive.

Evidence

14. The Committee has been provided with documentary material in relation to the heads of charge that Ms Horri faces, including the witness statements and documentary exhibits of Colleague A; the production witness statement and documentary exhibits of a senior paralegal with the GDC's solicitors, namely Kingsley Napley; and the reports of the GDC's expert witness, namely Nikolai Stankiewicz.
15. The Committee heard oral evidence from Colleague A and Mr Stankiewicz.

Committee's findings of fact

16. The Committee has taken into account all the evidence presented to it, both written and oral. It has considered the submissions made by Mr Phillips on behalf of the GDC. The Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020).
17. The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee is mindful that the burden of proof lies with the GDC, and has considered the heads of charge against the civil standard of proof, that is to say, the balance of probabilities. The Committee has considered each head and sub-head of charge separately, although some of its findings will be announced together.
18. I will now announce the Committee's findings in relation to each head of charge:

1.	<i>On 15 March 2022 failed to maintain adequate standards of decontamination in that:</i>
1. (a)	<p><i>You directed Colleague A*, a Dental Nurse, to not clean potentially contaminated dental instruments before sterilisation; and/or</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
1. (b)	<p><i>You directed Colleague A, a Dental Nurse, to not clean potentially contaminated hand pieces before sterilisation.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-heads of charge 1 (a) and 1 (b) proved.</p> <p>The Committee accepts the unchallenged evidence of Colleague A. Colleague A's evidence is that Ms Horri instructed her not to clean dental instruments before placing them in the autoclave for sterilisation. Colleague A explains that it was her usual practice to soak, scrub and rinse the instruments before placing them in the autoclave, but that Ms Horri told her to skip these steps and place them straight into the autoclave due to the lack of available time. Colleague A stated that she questioned this direction, but did as she was instructed. Colleague A makes a distinction regarding the handpiece that Ms Horri used, in that she would normally give the handpiece a good wipe and oiling before sterilising, with no soaking required, but the Committee understands Colleague A's evidence to mean that Ms Horri's direction not to clean instruments before placing them in the autoclave for sterilisation to include the handpiece. The Committee finds Colleague A's evidence, which is unchallenged, to be credible, and demonstrates good knowledge of the topic of decontamination practices.</p> <p>The Committee also accepts the unchallenged expert evidence of Mr Stankiewicz. Mr Stankiewicz opines that Ms Horri was under a duty as the supervising dentist to ensure that dental instruments were cleaned prior to sterilisation, and that were the Committee to find that she did not do so, this would amount to a failure to maintain adequate standards of decontamination and may place patients at the risk of harm. The Committee accepts this evidence, and finds that Ms Horri failed to maintain adequate standards of decontamination.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-heads of charge 1 (a) and 1 (b) proved.</p>
2.	<i>On 15 March 2022 failed to maintain adequate standards of cross-infection control in that:</i>
2. (a)	<p><i>You brought a potentially contaminated flat plastic instrument into contact with a container of composite; and</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
2. (b)	<p><i>You intended to use the composite within the container on another patient.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>

	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-heads of charge 2 (a) and 2 (b) proved.</p> <p>The Committee accepts the unchallenged evidence of Colleague A. Colleague A's evidence is that, whilst using a 'flat plastic' instrument, Ms Horri brought the instrument into contact with a container containing composite material, more particularly a syringe, and then used the same instrument to place composite material onto a patient's tooth, with the residual composite material liable to be used for subsequent patients. Colleague A's evidence is that in her experience a dentist would normally use one flat plastic instrument to dispense composite from the container on to a paper pad, from which paper pad the dispensed composite could be applied to the patient's tooth using another flat plastic instrument. The Committee finds Colleague A's evidence, which is unchallenged, to be credible. As with the preceding head of charge Colleague A demonstrates good knowledge of the topic of cross-infection controls.</p> <p>The Committee also accepts the unchallenged expert evidence of Mr Stankiewicz. Mr Stankiewicz opines that, if the Committee were to find as a matter of fact that Ms Horri was using a contaminated flat plastic instrument to transfer composite from a composite container to the patient's tooth or teeth, with the intent of using that same composite for successive patients, this would amount to a failure to maintain adequate standards of cross-infection control and may place patients at the risk of harm. The Committee accepts this evidence, and finds that Ms Horri failed to maintain adequate standards of cross-infection control.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-heads of charge 2 (a) and 2 (b) proved.</p>
3.	<i>On or before 15 March 2022 failed to adequately check Colleague A's suitability to work as a Dental Nurse, before engaging her to work as a locum Dental Nurse in that:</i>
3. (a)	<p><i>You did not obtain proof of Colleague A's identity;</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
3. (b)	<p><i>You did not obtain documentary evidence that she was appropriately registered with the GDC;</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
3. (c)	<p><i>You did not obtain documentary evidence of her qualifications;</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
3. (d)	<p><i>You did not obtain a full employment history with explanations for gaps in employment;</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
3. (e)	<p><i>You did not obtain evidence of a Disclosure and Barring Scheme check.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-heads of charge 3 (a), 3 (b), 3 (c), 3 (d) and 3 (e) proved.</p>

	<p>The Committee accepts the unchallenged evidence of Colleague A. Colleague A's evidence is that she replied to an advertisement for a one-day locum dental nurse shift at a private dental practice on 15 March 2022. Colleague A states that she first met Ms Horri on arrival at the start of her shift on the morning of 15 March 2022, and that Ms Horri appeared to be the sole practitioner and provider of dental services at the practice. Colleague A's evidence is that Ms Horri did not ask her for, and did not obtain from her, proof of Colleague A's identity, GDC registration, qualifications, full employment history and Disclosure and Barring Scheme (DBS) check. Colleague A also states that she had not been asked for, or had provided, any of these items by anyone else prior to commencing her shift with Ms Horri. Colleague A states that, <i>after</i> the day in question, she received an email from Ms Horri on 19 March 2022 in which Ms Horri stated that Colleague A had not provided a curriculum vitae (CV), reference, GDC registration number, immunisation certificate and other relevant documents. Colleague A then replied to Ms Horri and provided each of the specified documents, except for her CV, which Colleague A considered to be irrelevant. The Committee finds Colleague A's evidence, which is unchallenged, to be credible.</p> <p>The Committee finds that Ms Horri was under a duty to adequately check Colleague A's suitability to work as a dental nurse, and that she failed to do so. The Committee is satisfied from the evidence presented to it that Ms Horri was the sole provider of dental services at the practice at which Colleague A worked on the day in question. The Committee accepts the unchallenged expert evidence of Mr Stankiewicz. Mr Stankiewicz opines that, if the Committee were to find that Ms Horri was the legal entity responsible for the provision of dental services at the practice, she was under a duty to undertake the checks specified at these sub-heads of charge. Mr Stankiewicz opines that, if she did not do so, this would amount to a failure which may put patients at the risk of harm.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at sub-heads of charge 3 (a), 3 (b), 3 (c), 3 (d) and 3 (e) proved.</p>
4.	<p><i>On or after 14 March 2022 failed to treat Colleague A fairly, in that you engaged her services as a locum Dental Nurse on 15 March 2022, and did not remunerate her as agreed or at all for the services she provided on 15 March 2022.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 4 proved.</p> <p>The Committee accepts the unchallenged evidence of Colleague A that she remains without remuneration for the work that she undertook for Ms Horri on 15 March 2022. The Committee notes that Colleague A sent an invoice to Ms Horri at the end of her shift that day, and having not received payment for her work she brought proceedings against Ms Horri at the Central London County Court. Those proceedings are the subject of the following head of charge. The documentary evidence presented to the Committee includes Ms Horri's unsuccessful dispute of the claim on the basis of her questioning Colleague A's clinical abilities. The Committee finds Colleague A's evidence, which is unchallenged, to be credible, and concludes that Ms Horri did not remunerate Colleague A for the work that Colleague A did on 15 March 2022.</p> <p>The Committee finds that Ms Horri was under a duty to remunerate Colleague A for the work that she did, and that her failure to do so meant that Colleague A was not treated fairly by Ms Horri.</p>

	Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 4 proved.
5.	<p><i>On or after 2 September 2022 you failed to comply with a Court Order issued by the Central London County Court, which required you to remunerate Colleague A for services provided to you during the course of your professional work.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 5 proved.</p> <p>The Committee has been provided with a copy of the court order issued by the Central London County Court on 2 September 2022 which required Ms Horri to pay Colleague A for the work that Colleague A did on 15 March 2022. As set out above at the previous head of charge, Colleague A's unchallenged evidence is that Ms Horri has still yet to comply with the order. The Committee accepts this evidence, and finds that Ms Horri was under a duty to comply with the court order, and has failed to do so.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 5 proved.</p>
6.	<i>On 2 September 2022 failed to communicate with Colleague A in a professional manner in that:</i>
6. (a)	<p><i>You sent two photographs to Colleague A via SMS message;</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
6. (b)	<p><i>The photographs were sent in response to the court order Colleague A obtained against you; and</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
6. (c)	<p><i>In this context, the photographs were intimidating/threatening and/or offensive.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at heads of charge 6 (a), 6 (b) and 6 (c) proved.</p> <p>The Committee accepts the unchallenged evidence of Colleague A that on 2 September 2022, on the afternoon of the County Court's judgment referred to above, Ms Horri sent two photographs to her by SMS. The Committee has been provided with copies of the two photographs in question. The Committee finds as a matter of fact that the photographs were sent as alleged and, given the proximity of time, were sent in response to the court order made against Ms Horri.</p> <p>The Committee also finds that these photographs were intimidating, threatening and offensive, given the proximity of time to the court order and given the nature of the photographs, which depict, respectively, a scene of public disorder and an unsettling image of a historical figure. The Committee heard from Colleague A that she felt 'humiliated' and that Ms Horri was 'laughing' at her.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at heads of charge 6 (a), 6 (b) and 6 (c) proved.</p>

7.	<p><i>Your conduct as described in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 put patient safety at risk.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 7 proved.</p> <p>The Committee has found above at heads of charge 1, 2 and 3 that Ms Horri's respective acts and omissions placed patients at the potential risk of harm.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 7 proved.</p>

19. We move to stage two.

Determination on misconduct, impairment and sanction – 12 November 2025

20. Following the handing down of the Committee's findings of fact on 11 November 2025, the hearing proceeded to stage two; that is to say, misconduct, impairment and sanction.

Proceedings at stage two

21. The Committee has considered all the evidence presented to it, both oral and written. It has taken into account the submissions made by Mr Phillips on behalf of the GDC. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

Evidence at stage two

22. The Committee received no further oral or written evidence at this stage of the hearing.

Summary of submissions

23. Mr Phillips on behalf of the GDC submitted that the facts that the Committee has found proved amount to misconduct, and that Ms Horri's fitness to practise is currently impaired, both with regard to public protection and wider public interest factors. Mr Phillips invited the Committee to direct that Ms Horri's registration be suspended for a period of six months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration.

Fitness to practise history

24. Mr Phillips addressed the Committee in accordance with Rule 20 (1) (a) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). Mr Phillips stated that Ms Horri has no fitness to practise history with the GDC.

Misconduct

25. The Committee first considered whether the facts that it has found proved constitute misconduct. In considering this and all other matters, the Committee has exercised its own independent judgement. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the following paragraphs of the GDC's *Standards for the Dental Team* (September 2013) in place at the time of the incidents giving rise to the facts that the Committee has found proved. These paragraphs state that as a dentist:

- 1.5 *You must treat patients in a hygienic and safe environment.*
- 1.5.1 *You must find out about the laws and regulations which apply to your clinical practice, your premises and your obligations as an employer and you must follow them at all times. This will include (but is not limited to) legislation relating to:*
- *the disposal of clinical and other hazardous waste;*
 - *radiography;*
 - *health and safety;*
 - *decontamination; and*
 - *medical devices [...]*
- 1.9 *You must find out about laws and regulations that affect your work and follow them.*
- 1.9.1 *You must find out about, and follow, laws and regulations affecting your work. This includes, but is not limited to, those relating to:*
- *data protection*
 - *employment*
 - *human rights and equality*
 - *registration with other regulatory bodies.*
- 6.1 *You must work effectively with your colleagues and contribute to good teamwork.*
- 6.1.2 *You must treat colleagues fairly and with respect, in all situations and all forms of interaction and communication. You must not bully, harass, or unfairly discriminate against them.*
- 6.1.3 *You must treat colleagues fairly in all financial transactions.*
- 9.1 *You must ensure that your conduct, both at work and in your personal life, justifies patients' trust in you and the public's trust in the dental profession.*
- 9.1.1 *You must treat all team members, other colleagues and members of the public fairly, with dignity and in line with the law.*
26. The Committee's findings relate to Ms Horri's failure to maintain adequate standards of decontamination and cross-infection control when practising on 15 March 2022, which put patient safety at risk; to her having failed to check Colleague A's suitability to work alongside her as a locum dental nurse on that day, which also put patient safety at risk; to her having failed to treat Colleague A fairly by not paying her for the work that she did; not complying with a court order to do so; and sending photographs to Colleague A in connection with that court order which were intimidating, threatening and offensive.
27. The Committee has determined that the facts that it has found proved amount to misconduct. The Committee considers that Ms Horri's acts and omissions were serious, and that her conduct represented a serious falling short of the standards reasonably to be expected of a registered dentist. In exercising its own independent judgement the Committee noted the view of the GDC's expert witness that Ms Horri's acts and omissions in relation to decontamination, cross-infection control and employment checks fell far short of the standards reasonably to be expected. Accordingly, the Committee has determined that the facts that it has found proved amount to misconduct.

Impairment

28. The Committee next considered whether Ms Horri's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found. In doing so, the Committee again exercised its own independent judgement. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has borne in mind that its overarching objective is to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
29. The Committee has determined that Ms Horri's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found. The Committee has been provided with no information whatsoever to suggest that Ms Horri has developed any insight into, or remediated, her misconduct. The Committee has therefore determined that the same risks to the safety and wellbeing of the public that arise out of her misconduct persist. Accordingly, Ms Horri's fitness to practise is impaired as a result.
30. The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is further required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. In the Committee's judgement the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the serious and multi-faceted nature of Ms Horri's misconduct.

Sanction

31. The Committee then determined what sanction, if any, is appropriate in light of the findings of facts, misconduct and impairment that it has made. The Committee recognises that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have such an effect, but is instead imposed to protect patients and safeguard the wider public interests mentioned above.
32. In reaching its decision the Committee has again taken into account the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with Ms Horri's own interests. The Committee has once more exercised its own independent judgement.
33. The Committee has paid careful regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors present in this case.
34. In respect of the mitigating factors that are present, the Committee notes that Ms Horri is of previous good character, with no fitness to practise history. The Committee also notes the amount of time that has elapsed since the incidents giving rise to these proceedings, namely over three years.
35. In terms of aggravating factors, the Committee notes that Ms Horri's failure to remunerate Colleague A resulted in a financial gain for her. The Committee is also mindful of Ms Horri's lack of insight into her misconduct, her breach of Colleague A's trust, and the risk of harm to patients that her acts and omissions entailed.
36. The Committee has considered the range of sanctions available to it, starting with the least restrictive. In the light of its findings, the Committee considers that taking no action or issuing a reprimand would not be sufficient in the particular circumstances of this case. In the Committee's judgement public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be significantly undermined if no action were taken or if a reprimand were issued.
37. The Committee next considered whether a direction of conditional registration would be appropriate. The Committee found that conditions would not be workable in circumstances

where Ms Horri has not engaged with these proceedings, as her lack of engagement means that it cannot reasonably identify conditions which might be workable, or be satisfied that she would comply. The Committee was also not satisfied that all of the matters that it has found proved would lend themselves to conditions, more particularly the findings relating to non-clinical matters. The Committee therefore determined that conditions would not provide the necessary protections to the public or the wider public interest.

38. The Committee next considered whether a direction of suspended registration would be appropriate. After careful consideration, the Committee determined that suspension is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose in the particular circumstances of this case. The Committee was again mindful that Ms Horri has not shown insight into, and poses a significant risk of repeating, her misconduct. The Committee also considers that public confidence and public safety would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction.
39. In alighting upon suspension as the appropriate sanction, the Committee did consider whether the higher, and ultimate, sanction of erasure from the register would be appropriate. The Committee determined that a direction of suspended registration would be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest, and that as such erasure would be disproportionate. The Committee considered in particular that, whilst serious, Ms Horri's misconduct does not connote a harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problem.
40. The Committee has determined to suspend Ms Horri's registration for a period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. The Committee considers that any lesser period of time would not be sufficient to protect the public and safeguard the wider public interest considerations that it has identified, or to allow Ms Horri sufficient time to develop and demonstrate insight into, and remediation of, her misconduct, should she be so minded.
41. Although it in no way wishes to bind or fetter the future Committee which will review this matter, the Committee considers that the next Committee may be assisted by Ms Horri providing evidence of her reflections upon the matters that have culminated in the Committee's findings; evidence of targeted continuing professional development (CPD), evidence of her compliance with the County Court order relevant to its findings; written protocols dealing with cross-infection, decontamination and employment practices; and audits demonstrating her compliance with the same.

Interim order

42. In accordance with Section 32 (9) of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended), the extant interim order in place on Ms Horri's registration made in consequence of the matters to which this hearing relates is hereby revoked.

Immediate order

43. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether it should make an immediate order of suspension pending its substantive direction of suspension taking effect.

Determination on immediate order – 12 November 2025

44. Mr Phillips on behalf of the GDC submitted that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest.
45. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee has again had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020).

46. In all the circumstances, the Committee considers that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The Committee has determined that, given the risks to the public and the public interest that it has identified, it would not be appropriate to permit Ms Horri to continue to practise before the substantive direction of suspension takes effect. The Committee considers that an immediate order for suspension is consistent with the findings that it has set out in its foregoing determination. The Committee also considers that an immediate order for suspension is proportionate.
47. The effect of the foregoing determination and this immediate order is that Ms Horri's registration will be suspended from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served upon her. Unless Ms Horri exercises her right of appeal, the substantive direction of suspension will be recorded in the register 28 days from the date of deemed service. Should Ms Horri decide to exercise her right of appeal, this immediate order of suspension will remain in place until the resolution of any appeal.
48. That concludes this case.