

PRIVATE HEARING**Health Committee
Review Hearing****2 July 2026**

Name: KADUJI, Nafisa
Registration number: 67075
Case number: CAS-200759-G8S6K7

General Dental Council: Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel.
Instructed by Naila Hadid, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct and health
Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)
Duration: 12 months

Committee members: Martin Isherwood (Dental Care Professional) (Chair)
Anjana Varshani (Dentist)
Catherine Pease (Lay)

Legal adviser: Graeme Dalglish

Committee Secretary: Andrew Keeling

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

1. This was a review hearing pursuant to Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing was for this Health Committee (HC)

to review Miss Kaduji's case and determine what action to take in relation to her registration.

2. Miss Kaduji did not attend the hearing and was not represented. Miss Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

Preliminary Matters

Application for hearing to be held in private

3. At the beginning of the hearing, Miss Bagott made an application for the hearing to take place entirely in private pursuant to Rule 53(1) and (2). Miss Bagott submitted that this would be appropriate as the matters in the case were inextricably linked to Miss Kaduji's health.
4. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.
5. The starting point for the Committee is for all hearings to be held in public as it is in the interests of justice to do so. However, a hearing may be held in private where it concerns matters that are inextricably linked to the health or private and family life of the Registrant concerned, under Rule 53(2). The Committee agreed that as the matters in this case involve Miss Kaduji's health, it would be appropriate for the hearing to be held entirely in private. The Committee therefore acceded to the application.

Decision on Service of the Notice of Hearing

6. As Miss Kaduji did not attend the hearing, the Committee next considered the issues of service and whether to proceed with the hearing in her absence. The Committee heard submissions from Miss Bagott. It heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.
7. The Committee considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Miss Kaduji in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the GDC's Fitness to Practise Rules 2006 ('the Rules') and Section 50A of the Act. The Committee received from the GDC an indexed hearing bundle, which contained a copy of the Notice of Hearing ('the notice'), dated 28 May 2026, thereby complying with the 28-day notice period. The hearing bundle also contained a Royal Mail '*Track and Trace*' document confirming that the notice was sent to Miss Kaduji's registered address by Special Delivery. A copy of the notice was also sent by first class post and emailed to Miss Kaduji on 28 May 2026.
8. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Miss Kaduji contained proper notification of today's hearing, including its time, date and that it will be conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams, and the other prescribed information including

notification that the Committee had the power to proceed with the hearing in Miss Kaduji's absence.

9. On the basis of the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that notice of the hearing had been served on Miss Kaduji in accordance with the Rules and the Act.

Decision on Proceeding in the Registrant's Absence

10. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 of the Rules to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Kaduji. The Committee approached the issue of proceeding in absence with the utmost care and caution. It took into account the factors to be considered in reaching its decision, as set out in the cases of *R v Jones [2002] UKHL 5* and *GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis [2016] EWCA Civ 162*. It remained mindful of the need to be fair to both Miss Kaduji and the GDC, taking into account the public interest and Miss Kaduji's own interests in the expeditious review of the suspension order imposed.
11. The Committee first concluded that all reasonable efforts had been taken to send the notification of hearing to Miss Kaduji in accordance with the Rules. It noted that Miss Kaduji was aware of the hearing as she had responded to the GDC by email on 23 June 2026. However, she did not mention whether she would be attending the hearing or request an adjournment, [PRIVATE]. The Committee concluded, therefore, that adjourning the hearing would not secure Miss Kaduji's future attendance and that she had voluntarily absented herself from the hearing.
12. In those circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and appropriate to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Kaduji.

Background

13. Miss Kaduji's case was first considered by a HC at a hearing that took place between 8 and 10 July 2024. Miss Kaduji did not attend this hearing and was not represented.
14. At that hearing, the HC found proved matters relating to Miss Kaduji's health, including that she had an adverse health condition [PRIVATE].
15. [PRIVATE].
16. There was also a finding that from 24 May 2022 to at least 14 November 2022, Miss Kaduji failed to cooperate with an investigation conducted by the GDC [PRIVATE].
17. Miss Kaduji was also found to have misled the GDC by making an inaccurate statement in relation to her health. [PRIVATE].
18. [PRIVATE].

19. The initial HC found that Miss Kaduji's failure to cooperate with the GDC's investigation, her inaccurate statement to the Council in relation to her health, and [PRIVATE] amounted to misconduct. That initial Committee stated that *"Miss Kaduji's conduct represents a serious departure from proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour"*.
20. The initial HC went on to determine that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of her misconduct on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. It stated in its determination:

"The Committee has determined that, whilst Miss Kaduji's misconduct is capable of being remedied, it has not been provided with any evidence to suggest that she had developed any insight into or reflections upon her misconduct, or that she has taken any steps to remedy her misconduct. The Committee has found that Miss Kaduji's acts and omissions have placed the public at unwarranted risk of harm. As Miss Kaduji has not demonstrated insight into, or remediation of, her misconduct, or indeed of any willingness to do so, the Committee considers that a repetition of her misconduct cannot be said to be highly unlikely. The Committee finds that the public is at unwarranted risk of harm because of Miss Kaduji's unremediated misconduct, and that accordingly her fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of misconduct.

The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour..."

21. In determining that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise was also impaired by reason of adverse health on public protection and wider public interest grounds, the initial HC stated:

[PRIVATE].

22. The initial HC determined to impose a suspension order on Miss Kaduji's registration for a period of 12 months. An immediate order of suspension was also imposed. In directing a review of the substantive suspension order shortly before its expiry, the initial HC stated:

'Although the Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the future Committee which will review Miss Kaduji's suspension, it considers that it would be assisted by her engagement and co-operation with the GDC, evidence of her reflections upon and insight into her adverse health and misconduct, and an updated medical report.'

23. A HC reviewed Miss Kaduji's case on 3 July 2025. Miss Kaduji did not attend the hearing and was not represented. The reviewing HC noted that Miss Kaduji had not

engaged in any meaningful way with the GDC since the substantive hearing. Therefore, there was no evidence before that Committee that she had any insight into her health condition or any evidence in relation to any reflections or remediation in respect of her misconduct.

24. In all the circumstances, that Committee concluded that a finding of current impairment was necessary for the protection of the public. It also determined that a finding of impairment was required in the wider public interest
25. Accordingly, that Committee determined that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of her adverse health and her misconduct.
26. That Committee determined to extend the current suspension order by a period of 12 months, with a review. It considered that the reviewing Committee would be assisted by evidence of her meaningful engagement and co-operation with the GDC, evidence of her reflections upon and insight into her adverse health and misconduct, and an updated medical report.

Today's Review

27. This Committee has comprehensively reviewed Miss Kaduji's case today. In doing so, it has considered all the evidence presented to it. It has taken account of the submissions of Miss Bagott, on behalf of the GDC, and the documentary evidence. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
28. Miss Bagott took the Committee through the background to the case. She submitted that, in effect, there has been no material change since the substantive hearing. She submitted that there is a persuasive burden on Miss Kaduji to show that her fitness to practise is not currently impaired. In respect of misconduct, she submitted that there is no evidence of any insight or steps taken by Miss Kaduji of remediation. She submitted that there was a real risk of repetition of the misconduct. She submitted, therefore, that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct.
29. In respect of Miss Kaduji's health, [PRIVATE], she submitted that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of her adverse health condition.
30. Furthermore, Miss Bagott submitted that a finding of impairment in respect of misconduct and adverse health was required in the wider public interest. She submitted that this was required to maintain public confidence in the profession given that Miss Kaduji has shown no insight into her misconduct or health condition and has not engaged in any meaningful way with these proceedings.
31. Miss Bagott invited the Committee to extend the suspension on Miss Kaduji's registration for 12 months. She submitted that any lesser sanction would not sufficiently protect the public or the public interest. She also submitted that a period of 12 months

would give Miss Kaduji a further opportunity to meaningfully engage with these proceedings.

Decision on Impairment

32. In making its decision, the Committee first sought to determine whether Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise is still impaired by reason of her adverse health and misconduct. It exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decision of the previous committee. It balanced Miss Kaduji's needs with those of the public and bore in mind that its primary duty is to protect the public, including by maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour. The Committee had regard to the GDC's guidance document, *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees'* (effective from 6 January 2026).

33. The Committee was mindful that there was a persuasive burden on Miss Kaduji to demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer currently impaired. However, it noted that there has been no material change in the circumstances of Miss Kaduji's case since the previous review hearing. The Committee has seen no evidence as recommended by the reviewing Committee, which was Miss Kaduji's meaningful engagement and co-operation with the GDC, evidence of her reflections upon and insight into her adverse health and misconduct, and an updated medical report.

[PRIVATE]

34. The Committee therefore concluded that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise remains currently impaired on public protection grounds by reason of misconduct and adverse health.

35. In relation to the public interest, the Committee concluded that, in the absence of any evidence of remediation and insight from Miss Kaduji in respect of either her health condition or misconduct, public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made on public interest grounds.

Committee's Decision on Sanction

36. The Committee next considered what sanction should be imposed on Miss Kaduji's registration. It bore in mind the need to protect patients and the public interest. The Committee once again had regard to the principle of proportionality, weighing the interests of the public with Miss Kaduji's own interests.

37. The Committee found that Miss Kaduji's fitness to practise remains impaired. In these circumstances, the Committee concluded that terminating the current suspension order would not be appropriate or sufficient for the protection of the public. The Committee was also satisfied that imposing conditions would not be workable owing to Miss Kaduji's continuing non-engagement with these proceedings as the Committee could not be reasonably confident that she would or could comply with an order of conditions.

38. The Committee therefore directed that Miss Kaduji's current period of suspension should be extended for a period of 12 months, with a review hearing before the expiry of the order. The Committee was satisfied that this was sufficient and proportionate given that Miss Kaduji has not meaningfully engaged with these proceedings or provided any evidence of remediation or insight into her adverse health condition or misconduct. The Committee also considered that a 12-month period would give Miss Kaduji a further opportunity to meaningfully engage with these proceedings.
39. The Committee further wished to re-iterate the recommendation of the previous reviewing Committee in that the future reviewing Committee may be assisted by evidence of Miss Kaduji's meaningful engagement and co-operation with the GDC, evidence of her reflections upon and insight into her adverse health and misconduct, and an updated medical report.
40. Miss Kaduji has 28 days, from the date that notice is deemed to have been served upon her to appeal this Committee's direction. Unless Miss Kaduji exercises her right of appeal, the current suspension order on her registration will be extended by a period of 12 months from the date that the current order would otherwise expire. In the event that Miss Kaduji exercises her right of appeal, the current suspension order will remain in force until the resolution of the appeal.
41. That concludes this hearing.