

GENERAL DENTAL COUNCIL

AND

PERRY, Julian Francis John

[Registration number: 58325]

NOTICE OF INQUIRY

SUBSTANTIVE HEARING

Notice that an inquiry will be conducted by a Practice Committee of the General Dental Council commencing at 10:00 am on 29 September 2025.

Please note that this hearing will be conducted remotely by video conference.

The heads of charge contained within this sheet are current at the date of publication. They are subject to amendments at any time before or during the hearing. For the final charge, findings of fact and determination against the registrant, please visit the Recent Decisions page at <https://www.dentalhearings.org/hearings-and-decisions/decisions> after this hearing has finished.

Committee members:	Matthew King	Dentist	Chair
	John Marley	Lay	
	Rachel McCoubrey	DCP	
Legal Adviser:	Mel Swinnerton		

CHARGE

PERRY, Julian Francis John, a dentist, BDS University of Birmingham 1983 Diploma in General Dental Practice (UK) 1997 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 29 September 2025 for an inquiry into the following charge:

The Charge

'The hearing will be held to consider the following charge against you:

That being a registered dentist:

- 1) *From at least 4 July 2023 until at least 7 December 2023, through your company, Pro Smile, you supplied tooth whitening products in a manner which was contrary to the General Dental Council's 11 July 2016 statement on tooth whitening, namely that:*
 - a) *You provided tooth whitening products that contained less than 6% hydrogen peroxide ("HP") but more than 0.1% HP, and consequently fell within the Cosmetic Products (Safety) (Amendment) Regulations 2012;*
 - b) *You supplied the tooth whitening products without an 'appropriate clinical examination' because:*
 - i. *Assessment was conducted through photographs provided by patients;*
 - ii. *There was no tactile assessment of the mouth;*
 - c) *Impressions were undertaken by patients rather than a trained GDC Registrant who was indemnified.*
 - d) *The first cycle of use by the patient was not carried out by a dental practitioner or under their 'direct supervision with an equivalent level of safety' because:*
 - i. *Trays were delivered directly to patients without the fit being adequately checked by a dentist.*
 - ii. *A dental practitioner did not watch the patient carry out the first cycle of use.*
- 2) *Your conduct in respect of allegation 1)a), 1)b), 1)c) and/or 1)d) was:*

- a) *Misleading;*
- b) *Dishonest in that you knew that your process was contrary to the 11 July 2016 statement and supplied the tooth whitening products regardless; and/or*
- c) *Put the safety of patients at risk.*

And that, in consequence of the matters set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.'