

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

3 July 2026

Name: MANIR, Haroon Mohammed Bin

Registration number: 258226

Case number: CAS-209736

General Dental Council: Tom Stevens, Counsel
Instructed by Georgina Mayles, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Not represented

Outcome: Fitness to practise no longer impaired. Suspension revoked

Committee members: Helen Wagner (Chair, lay member)
Jonathan Farmer (Dentist member)
Leeann Sadler (Dental Care Professional member)

Legal adviser: Edward Hosking

Committee Secretary: Jenny Hazell

Mr Manir:

1. This is a resumed hearing of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) which is being held in accordance with section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').
2. The hearing is being conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams. You are present at the hearing, unrepresented. Mr Tom Stevens, Counsel, appears on behalf of the GDC.
3. On 12 January 2026 the PCC directed that your registration be made subject to suspension for 3 months and directed that a review take place. On 9 April 2026 the PCC reviewed the order and determined that the suspension order be extended for a further 3 months with a review. The purpose of today's hearing is to review that order before its expiry on 8 August 2026.

Preliminary matter – admissibility of evidence

4. At the outset of the hearing Mr Stevens made a preliminary application under Rule 57(1) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the Rules) for the Committee to disregard a screenshot dated 29 April 2026 from Companies House (page 41 of the main hearing bundle) as well as a letter dated 29 April 2026 from the GDC to you in connection with this matter (pages 42 to 43 of the main hearing bundle). The GDC's position is that the Committee has insufficient contextual evidence upon which it could fairly assess this information and it would be unfair to rely on it.
5. The Committee has accepted the Legal Adviser's advice as to the provisions of Rule 57. The Committee, having regard to the GDC's submissions, is satisfied that it would not be in the interests of justice to admit those documents since they do not relate to the matters that form the subject matter of the review and it is not able to fairly assess its probative value. Accordingly, the Committee has acceded to the GDC's application and has disregarded pages 41 to 43 of the main hearing bundle.

Background to the case

6. In January 2026 the PCC considered allegations about your fitness to practise. You were present at that hearing, unrepresented. The PCC found proved allegations about your contact and co-operation with the GDC regarding concerns about your fitness to practise as follows:

'The Committee has found that, on 8 November 2023, following a request that the GDC had made, you inaccurately confirmed your current postal address as being a dental practice which you had in fact left some time earlier in January 2021. The Committee has also found that, for the four-year period of around 19 January 2021 to 31 December 2024, you failed to maintain a correct and up-to-date address with the GDC. The Committee found that such matters amounted to misleading conduct.'

The Committee found that that you did not provide the GDC with the dental records for Patient 3 in the period of 6 February 2024 to 24 June 2024, and did not provide the dental records for two other patients, who are referred to as Patient 1 and Patient 2, in the period of 8 November 2023 to 9 April 2024.

The Committee has also found that, from around 6 February 2024, you did not provide it with details of your working arrangements and, from that approximate date until around 9 April 2024, you did not provide evidence of your indemnity insurance arrangements.'

7. The PCC bore in mind that your conduct was sustained and repeated over a considerable period of time. It included your failure to co-operate with the GDC which deprived it of full, timely and accurate information necessary to fulfil its functions. The PCC was satisfied that the findings amounted to misconduct. It noted the steps you had taken to put in place reliable systems for corresponding with the GDC. However, the PCC was not satisfied that you had embedded the necessary changes in your approach to co-operating with the GDC. The PCC described in its determination that your insight into these matters was “limited” and was “developing”. The PCC concluded that there was a risk of repetition and determined that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of that misconduct, both on the grounds of the public protection and public interest.

8. The PCC determined that the appropriate and proportionate sanction was one of suspension for a period of three months. It considered that this period of time would be sufficient to meet the public protection and public interest considerations as well as to allow you sufficient time to develop your insight your misconduct. The PCC further directed a review hearing to be convened before the expiry of that period of suspended registration. It indicated that a future reviewing Committee may be assisted by an updated reflective statement from you, evidence of focussed learning and documentary evidence of the embedding of the necessary changes in your practice.

Review hearing 9 April 2026

9. The PCC reviewed the order on 9 April 2026. You were present at the hearing, unrepresented. You also gave evidence at the hearing.

10. The PCC reminded itself that the misconduct that was previously identified related to you failing to keep the GDC informed of your current postal address, and failing to provide information that the GDC requested of you. The PCC had regard to the reflective statement written by you, together with CPD and other evidence. You also gave oral evidence in which you provided your reflections upon those failings, and of your efforts to remedy them. However, the PCC considered that the evidence presented was not sufficient for it to conclude that a repeat of your misconduct was now highly unlikely. It considered *“that your engagement with the GDC in anticipation of this hearing belies your assertions of insight and remediation.”* The PCC further noted that the address that you maintained with the GDC was an address at which you were not able to receive correspondence in a timely manner.

11. The PCC therefore concluded that you continued to pose a risk to the public. The PCC therefore determined that your fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of your misconduct on the grounds of the protection of the public.

12. The PCC further concluded that a finding of current impairment was again required in the wider public interest, more particularly in order to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession.

13. The PCC determined that a further period of suspension for three months was appropriate and proportionate. In its determination, the PCC stated that a reviewing Committee *“may be assisted by your full and prompt engagement with and response to all correspondence sent to you by the GDC, by you adhering to the requirement to keep your address up to date with the GDC, an updated reflective statement from you, evidence of any further learning focussed on the Committee’s findings, such as CPD, and documentary evidence of the embedding of the necessary changes in your practice”*.

Today’s review hearing

14. The Committee has carried out a comprehensive review of the order. In so doing it has had regard to the documents before it contained in the main review bundle, including copies of the PCC’s

determinations of January 2026 and April 2026. The Committee has also been provided with an addendum bundle (which it has been informed contains the same documents that was presented to the PCC at the last review hearing in April 2026). That bundle contains copies of CPD certificates; an email from you to the GDC enclosing photos of workstations and email priority settings as well as a copy of your reflective statement dated 29 March 2026. In your reflective statement you accepted the failings against you and you say that you deeply regret them. You also set out the impact of your actions.

15. You set out in that statement the steps you have taken to address the concerns, including ensuring that your postal address and contact details held by the GDC are accurate and regularly monitored. You have further implemented safeguards to ensure this situation cannot recur, including designated time to review regulatory correspondence.

Summary of submissions

16. Mr Stevens set out the key considerations for the Committee at this review hearing. He, on behalf of the GDC, made no positive submissions that your fitness to practise remains impaired and said that the Committee was best placed to decide the matter based on the information before it. Mr Stevens submitted that, were the Committee to conclude that your fitness to practise remains impaired, then the GDC would be inviting the Committee to direct a further period of suspended registration with a review hearing. It was Mr Stevens' submission that depending on the Committee's findings, a period of six months' suspension, to allow for further reflection and the provision of further evidence, would be appropriate.

17. You gave oral submissions to the Committee. You invited the Committee to consider the 15 hours of CPD you have undertaken as well as your written reflections, which you say the previous PCC did not give sufficient weight to. You say that you feel you have exhausted all avenues in terms of remediation or undertaking relevant CPD and feel that the information you have provided is sufficient to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

18. You submitted that the previous PCC focused more on your delayed response to the GDC's Notice of Hearing confirming your attendance at that hearing within the three week window, rather than taking into account your CPD and your reflections of the changes in your practice. You explained that your GDC registered address is your Practice address, which is some distance from your home address. At that time you were not driving to your Practice on a weekly basis to check your mail. By the time you collected the paper copy of the Notice of Hearing at your Practice you realised you had missed the GDC's three week deadline notifying them of your attendance at the hearing.

19. You explained that you now drive to your Practice on a regular basis to carry out administrative tasks. You confirmed that you have a Practice Manager who attends the Practice in the morning to deal with any post. You also set out that in your practice you have prioritised correspondence from the GDC and other regulatory bodies in a timely manner by setting them up as priority email alerts. You made reference to the fact that on receipt of the GDC's Notice of Hearing dated 21 May 2026 by email you immediately sent an email to the GDC the following day (22 May 2026) confirming your attendance at this hearing. You confirmed that you received a paper copy of the Notice of Hearing by post. The Committee has had regard to Notice of Hearing dated 21 May 2026 which states that it was sent by special delivery, first class post and secure email to you.

Committee's determination

20. The Committee has carried out a fresh assessment of your case. It has borne in mind that it is not bound by the previous PCCs' decision. It has considered all the information presented to it, including the submissions made by both parties.

21. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. It has borne in mind that you bear the effective burden of demonstrating that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Impairment

22. The Committee has exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decisions of the previous Committees. It has borne in mind that its primary duty is the protection of the public, including maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour.

23. The Committee has had regard to your reflective statement as to the steps you have taken to address the concerns in this case, which primarily relate to your timely engagement with the GDC. This includes ensuring that your postal address and contact details held by the GDC are accurate and regularly monitored and having systems in place whereby you have set up priority email alerts in relation to emails from the GDC, as demonstrated by the screenshots you provided. It is also clear from the information before the Committee that on receipt of the GDC's Notice of Hearing dated 21 May 2026 you responded the following day to confirm that you would be attending today's hearing.

24. The Committee has noted that you have not provided any new documentary information in relation to this hearing, as recommended by the previous PCC. However, the Committee considers that the steps you have taken since the last review hearing in April 2026 in relation to your communications with the GDC, as well as your reflections on the matters found proved, and in the oral submissions you made at the hearing, cover the points recommended by that PCC. Taking all this evidence into account, the Committee is satisfied that you have addressed the concerns identified in this case and that you have taken practical steps to ensure that there will be no repetition of your past misconduct. It is now satisfied that the necessary changes in your engagement and co-operation are now embedded into your practice and that you no longer pose a risk to the public. Accordingly, the Committee has concluded that a finding of current impairment is no longer necessary for the protection of the public.

25. The Committee further considers that a finding of current impairment is no longer required in the wider public interest. It considers that a well-informed member of the public would consider that you have satisfactorily remediated your misconduct and the seriousness of your misconduct has now been appropriately marked by your period of suspension since January 2026.

26. Accordingly, for all these reasons, the Committee determined to terminate the suspension order with immediate effect.

27. That concludes this hearing today.