

**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing**

**15 – 23 May 2025
10 – 12 November 2025**

Name: MADZHIROVA, Hristina

Registration number: 256583

Case number: CAS-202520-H8R6B1

General Dental Council: Tom Stevens, Counsel
Instructed by Holly Watt, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Erased

Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Anthony Mole (Chair, lay member)
Alison Mayell (Dentist member)
Victoria Hewson (Dental Care Professional member)

Legal adviser: Williams Hoskins

Committee Secretary: Sara Page (15 – 21 May 2025)
(10 – 12 November 2025)

Andrew Keeling (22 and 23 May 2025)

FINDINGS OF FACT – 11 November 2025

MADZHIROVA, Hristina

Registration Number: 256583

Ms Madzhirova,

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing. The members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, conducted the hearing remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current General Dental Council (GDC) practice. Stage 1 of the hearing took place between 15 May 2025 and 23 May 2025, by which time the Committee had completed its deliberations on facts. The Committee's determination on Stage 1 was handed down when the hearing resumed on 11 November 2025.
2. You were present at the hearing and unrepresented.
3. Mr Tom Stevens, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

Preliminary matter (15 May 2025)

4. At the outset of the hearing, Mr Stevens notified the Committee that you had indicated that you were only available to attend the hearing on Day 1, Day 5 and Day 7 of the days currently scheduled for this hearing. He told the Committee that this was due to your work commitments but that you were content to attend the hearing when you were available. Mr Stevens confirmed that whilst there were witnesses due to attend to give their oral evidence, you did not have any questions for those witnesses and were content for them to be heard in your absence. He submitted that in this regard, it would be in the public interest, and in your own interest, for the hearing to proceed with your partial attendance. Mr Stevens proposed a timetable to hear the witnesses over the coming days and where time could be used efficiently to conclude the GDC's case prior to Day 5, when you would next be able to attend and provide your own evidence and present your case in defence of your position.
5. You confirmed to the Committee that you were unable to take any further time off work to attend the other dates of this sitting as you were scheduled to work on those dates. You stated that, were the Committee minded to adjourn, it was unlikely that your circumstances would change and that you would have greater availability should the matter be listed at a later date. You told the Committee that this case has been going on for some three years and it was your wish for it to proceed today so that it could be concluded as quickly as possible. You confirmed that you were satisfied with the proposal regarding the timetabling as outlined by Mr Stevens.
6. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, including the requirement to consider fairness to both parties and to exercise utmost care and caution in coming to its decision.
7. The Committee acknowledged its obligation to conduct these proceedings expeditiously by ensuring the outcome of this case was not unduly delayed, as it is in the interests of all parties, and the wider public interest, that hearings are held as soon as possible.
8. The Committee noted that Mr Stevens had indicated that there were a number of witnesses who had been warned to attend these proceedings and were expecting to give evidence over the coming days. It considered the inconvenience that adjourning this case would have on the witnesses and noted the effect any further delay may have on their memory of the matter.
9. The Committee was satisfied that there would be limited unfairness to you were it minded to proceed in your partial absence, as you had made it clear that you did not want the hearing to be adjourned and that you were willing to attend as fully as you were able whilst honouring your working arrangements. You also told the Committee that you had no questions for the witnesses to be called by the GDC. In addition, the Committee noted that even if the hearing was adjourned, it was likely that any future listing would be affected in the same way, as your working arrangements were unlikely to have changed sufficiently to enable you to attend a full seven day sitting.

10. In light of all the information before it, the Committee concluded that it would be fair, appropriate and proportionate to proceed with the current listing and that an adjournment would serve no useful purpose.
11. Therefore, the Committee determined to proceed with the current sitting and to adhere to the proposed timetable outlined by Mr Stevens.

Charges

12. The charges being considered by the Committee, as detailed in the Notice of Hearing, dated 7 April 2025, are as follows:

'That being a registered dental care professional:

1. *Whilst enrolled on a dental implant nursing course:*
 - a) *on 27 November 2022, at around 11:08, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;*
 - b) *on 27 November 2022, at around 11:10, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;*
 - c) *on 27 November 2022, at around 20:02, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', that:*
 - i. *contained a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;*
 - ii. *suggested you had completed a dental activity called*
 - iii. *"maintenance study 2" on 28 November 2022;*
 - iv. *suggested witness 1 had assessed and/or witnessed you completing*
 - v. *"maintenance study 2" on 28 November 2022;*
 - d) *on 28 November 2022, at around 13:34, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;*
 - e) *on 28 November 2022, at around 13:45, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;*
 - f) *on 28 November 2022, at around 13:57, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1.*
2. *Your conduct in Charge 1.a) and/or 1.b) and/or 1.c)i. and/or 1.d) and/or 1.e) and/or 1.f) was:*
 - a) *misleading;*
 - b) *lacking in integrity;*
 - c) *dishonest – in that you knew the PCAS you uploaded contained a falsified signature.*
3. *Your conduct in Charge 1.c)ii was:*



- a) *misleading;*
- b) *lacking in integrity;*
- c) *dishonest – in that you knew you had not yet completed the activity listed.*

4. *Your conduct in Charge 1.c.)iii was:*

- a) *misleading;*
- b) *lacking in integrity;*
- c) *dishonest – in that you knew you Witness 1 had not assessed and/or witnessed you complete the activity listed on 28 November 2022.*

5. *Between 13 December 2022 and 28 March 2024 you sent emails containing the comments contained in Schedule A to Witness 2.*

6. *Your conduct in relation to Charge 5 was inappropriate and/or unprofessional in respect of items 1, and/or 2, and/or 3, and/or 4, and/or 5, and/or 6, and/or 7, and/or 8, and/or 9, and/or 10, listed in Schedule A.*

7. *Between 5 May 2023 and 16 August 2023 you sent emails containing the comments contained in Schedule B to Witness 3.*

8. *Your conduct in relation to Charge 7 was:*

- a) *inappropriate and/or unprofessional in respect of items 1, and/or 2, and/or 3, and/or 4, and/or 5, and or 6, listed in Schedule B;*
- b) *intimidating and/or threatening in respect of items 2, and/or 3, and/or 4, and/or 5, and/or 6, listed in schedule B.*

AND that by reason of the matters alleged above your fitness to practise is impaired by reasons of misconduct.'

Admissions

13. You confirmed that you denied all the charges and denied that your fitness to practise is impaired.

Finding of facts

14. In its consideration of the disputed allegations, the Committee had regard to the evidence adduced and the background of this case.

Evidence

15. The Committee had regard to a number of documents included within the GDC hearing bundle, referred to as Exhibit 1. This bundle included, but was not limited to, the following documents:

- Witness statements of:
 - Witness 1 (Dentist at the Practice and supervisor for your Dental Implant course);
 - Witness 2 (Owner of 'Delta Dental', a training course provider for Dental Nurses);

- Witness 3 (Tutor for your Dental Implant training course);
 - Witness 4 (Director of Education and Regulation at the National Examining Board for Dental Nurses);
 - Witness 5 (Practice Manager);
 - Witness 6 (Operations Manager at the Practice).
- Two ‘*Standard Directions Response Form*’, dated 28 October 2024 and 5 April 2025;
 - Your written statement, undated;
 - Emails between you and Greater Manchester Police, dated 25 August 2023.

16. The Committee heard oral evidence from Witness 3, Witness 4 and Witness 5.
17. As part of your case, you also gave oral evidence at the hearing. Furthermore, you provided the Committee with two references. At your request, one of the referees (Witness 7) gave oral evidence.

Decision and reasons on application regarding admissibility of evidence (16 May 2025)

18. During the course of the hearing, Mr Stevens made an application relating to Witness 2’s evidence, pursuant to Rule 57 of ‘*The General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*’.
19. Mr Stevens referred the Committee to Exhibit 1 and to the written witness statement of Witness 2. He reminded the Committee that Witness 2 is the owner of the dental nursing implant course that you were enrolled on as of 2022. The Committee had the benefit of hearing oral evidence from Witness 3, your course tutor. Mr Stevens stated that Witness 2 has produced a written statement with a declaration of truth, signed and dated 18 September 2024. Alongside that, there are various documents exhibited as part of Witness 2’s statement including a number of emails sent by you to Witness 2, as detailed in Schedule A.
20. Mr Stevens informed the Committee that, when timetabling these matters, Witness 2 notified the GDC that she would be on holiday overseas and would be returning on Wednesday 21 May 2025. Initially, Witness 2 indicated that she would be willing to provide evidence upon her return to the United Kingdom. However, in subsequent email correspondence with the GDC, Witness 2 indicated an unwillingness to take part in the hearing. She indicated that her unwillingness was as a result of her returning from a long flight and her frustration with the process. Mr Stevens made it clear that this application was not as a result of a witness withdrawing from the process and withdrawing their support and statement. Witness 2 has made it clear that she stood by her statement but did not wish to attend to provide oral evidence.
21. As a result, Mr Stevens made an application for her statement to remain in evidence before the Committee despite the author not being available for questioning. He acknowledged that the Committee had indicated that it may have questions for Witness 2, but it was significant that you have clarified you do not have any questions for Witness 2. To assist the Committee in making its decision, Mr Stevens referred the Committee to Rule 57(1), that it may receive oral, documentary or other evidence that is admissible in civil proceedings. He also referred to Rule 57(2), that the Committee may, at its discretion, treat other evidence as admissible if, after consultation with the Legal Adviser, it considered that it would be helpful, and in the interests of justice, for the evidence to be heard. He further referred the Committee to relevant case law in this regard.
22. Mr Stevens submitted that Witness 2’s evidence is not sole and decisive as there is supporting evidence from other witnesses, who have attended to give oral evidence before the Committee. He submitted that the evidence of Witness 2 does not speak directly to the probity issues in this case but sets a helpful chronology and provides context for the Committee in relation to the course and

what it involved, and how the concerns about your submissions of your 'Record of Competence' (RoC) came about. He therefore submitted that Witness 2's evidence met the threshold for relevance, but it is the evidence of Witness 3 that gives more specific information about your involvement in the course. In addition, Mr Stevens submitted that Witness 2 also speaks to how the matter was raised with the Practice, which is supported by the evidence of Witness 5.

23. In relation to the second aspect of this case, the email communications, Mr Stevens indicated that Witness 2's statement exhibits emails that are relevant to the consideration of Charges 5 and 6. He submitted that it would be wrong to characterise the emails exhibited by Witness 2 as hearsay evidence as Witness 2 is not the author of the emails and merely exhibits them. He reminded the Committee that the emails are available to the Committee, as Schedule A. Mr Stevens submitted that as you were the author of the emails, not Witness 2, you would be available for the Committee to question in due course should you exercise your right to respond to the allegations and subject to your availability to attend.
24. Mr Stevens made it clear that the emails themselves could not be considered as hearsay evidence as they are freestanding documents. However, he made an application for the admissibility of Witness 2's supporting evidence, to provide a chronology and context, given her non-attendance.
25. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
26. Having carefully considered the submissions of Mr Stevens and the evidence before it, the Committee was satisfied that Witness 2's evidence, in relation to the probity matters in this case (Charges 1 – 4), was not sole and decisive evidence. It acknowledged that Witness 3 has provided oral evidence and specific information about your involvement with the course and the documentation required for its completion. It was satisfied that Witness 2's evidence was supplementary and did provide a helpful chronology and context to the matters before it. Therefore, it concluded that it would be fair and appropriate in the circumstances to admit Witness 2's evidence and that there would be no prejudice caused to you as a result.
27. In relation to the email correspondence (Charges 5 – 8), the Committee was again satisfied that as Witness 2 was not the author of the emails, and that as the content of the emails themselves has been made available to it (Schedule A), the emails should not be characterised as hearsay. However, it was content that Witness 2's supporting evidence was helpful and provided a clear context and chronology to the charges. With this in mind, the Committee concluded that the Witness 2's evidence was not sole and decisive and that it would be fair and proper to admit her evidence to assist with its decision making on the facts, without causing prejudice to you.

Background

28. In November 2022, you were working full time as a Dental Nurse at the Practice, having commenced employment there in April 2022.
29. You enrolled at 'Delta Dental', a training course provider owned and operated by Witness 2, on 20 January 2022 and were registered for a 9 – 12 month course, 'Certificate in Dental Implant' nursing course. Your tutor for the course was Witness 3 and you were required to complete a practice portfolio, namely a 'Record of Competence' (RoC), before sitting an end of course exam.
30. On 29 November 2022, Witness 3 contacted Witness 2 regarding concerns she had relating to the authenticity of signatures in your RoC. Witness 3 stated that when students assist in surgery, a supervising Dentist, after witnessing your practice, is then required to complete the feedback form and sign off the competency in the signature space at the end of the form. Witness 3 stated that she thought that one of the signatures, signed off as being that of Witness 1, was not genuine. She queried the timing of the signature as Witness 1's signature had been provided before the procedure was said to have taken place.

31. As a result of the concerns raised, Witness 2 checked your record of competence and noted that the signatures within it were all different but were signed off *'in one go'* by the same person, Witness 1. Signatures for Witness 1 had been provided throughout your RoC, so Witness 2 checked previous signatures and noted that Witness 1's signatures for 27 and 28 November 2022 were different to Witness 1's previous signatures. Witness 1's signature was cross-referenced with another record of competence and Witness 2 concluded that the signatures in your record of competence did not appear to be those of Witness 1.
32. It was also noted that your Practical Competency Assessment Sheets had been signed off on a Sunday on the 'PebblePad' system, a platform used to sign off and upload work for a trainee's RoC. The only way to access PebblePad was through an individual student login as workplace supervisors did not have an independent login to access PebblePad. Three items were uploaded to your PebblePad which had been signed off by Witness 1 on Sunday 27 November 2022 at 11:08, 11:10, and 20:02.
33. At those times on Sunday 27 November 2022, your RoC recorded entries for Monday 28 November 2022, including:
 - You assisted for a restorative abutment connection after which you submitted a completed witness feedback form at 13:34 that same day;
 - You assisted for a restorative bridge procedure after which you submitted a completed witness feedback form at 13:45 that same day;
 - You assisted for a denture implant procedure, implant maintenance, and bone augmentation after which you submitted a completed witness feedback form at 13:57 that same day.
34. On 1 December 2022, Witness 2 called the practice to ascertain whether Witness 1 was working, whether you were working and whether they were both working together on Monday 28 November 2022. Witness 2 noted that the implant cases were signed or completed and a few had been signed off on Sunday 27 November 2022.
35. Witness 5 checked the appointment book and confirmed that Witness 1 did not work at the Practice on Mondays, and you were not rostered to work on Monday 28 November 2022.
36. Following advice from Human Resources on 8 December 2022, Witness 5 conducted an internal investigation. During the course of the investigation, Witness 1 was asked about the signatures provided on PebblePad and he confirmed that the signatures were not his. He confirmed that he did not have access to PebblePad and that he had not worked on Sunday 27 November 2022, when the forms were submitted, or on Monday 28 November 2022, when the treatments were allegedly undertaken.
37. On 1 December 2022 after the call to the practice, Witness 2 wrote a letter to you, which was sent by email, with the concerns raised. She put to you the issues they found and that she had contacted the practice and they had to investigate the issues raised. You were provided with a deadline of a week to respond.
38. On 8 December 2022, Witness 2 stated that she emailed you confirming that as a result of the concerns and your failure to respond to an email sent to you on 1 December 2022, you had been removed from the course.
39. On 14 December 2022, a meeting was held in which you were asked by Witness 5 about the concerns that had been raised. Witness 5 stated that you did not appear to take the meeting seriously and were *'playing with your phone'* throughout, but provided your own explanation for the discrepancies in the dates you said you had undertaken procedures alongside Witness 1. Witness

5 recalled that you had described the PebblePad forms as a working document and that you had marked them with a view that Witness 1 would sign them at a later date. Witness 5 stated that you were very concerned in the meeting about the money you had paid for the course and how long it had taken.

40. On 19 December 2022, a disciplinary meeting was held at the Practice between you and Witness 5. Witness 5 described your demeanour at the meeting as curt, abrupt and dismissive, and that you did not appear to be taking the meeting seriously. Witness 5 stated that you admitted to not having carried out the procedures and having signed the forms in the name of Witness 1, but *'did not see anything wrong in do [so].'*
41. It is alleged that between 13 December 2022 and 28 March 2024, Witness 2 received ten emails from your email address relating to a number of complaints about the course, the course tutor (Witness 3), asking for a refund for the money paid to the course escalating to a request for a sum of £36k to £37k, accusing the course providers of being *'scammers'*, and making threats relating to Witness 3. An email sent on 21 August 2023 stated, *'...your useless tutor (Witness 3) you have to refund me £36,700. In this amount are included 18 months suspension, tax fee for the course and book...[sic]'* A further email sent on 28 March 2024 stated, *'I am absolutely sick of (Witness 3) and her tutoring. This lady traumatise me more that two years with her unprofessionalism...[sic].'*
42. It is further alleged that, between 5 May and 16 August 2023, Witness 3 received six emails from your email address relating to demands for money, making complaints about her professionalism and her competence as a tutor and as a person. An email sent at 01:49 on 16 August 2023 stated, *'You are useless, unprofessional, unhelpful and nasty tutor. You have to refund me full amount and 18 months suspension. Until you do not sent me that money I wish you all the bad things in the worlds for you and your family...'* [sic].
43. Witness 2 confirmed that the emails were considered to amount to harassment, and had requested you to stop emailing her or any member of her team. You ignored this request and the matter was referred to the police. Witness 3 found the emails to be of a threatening nature and supported the matter being reported to the police by Witness 2. The police updated you on 25 August 2023 and informed you that due to the number and extent of the emails it was now considered to be harassment and the correspondence between you and the training provider needed to stop or the matter would be taken further. At this point, the crime report was closed. However, if the correspondence continued the police stated that the crime number would be re-opened and investigated.

Decision and reasons on the facts

44. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it and took account of the closing submissions made by Mr Stevens, on behalf of the GDC, and by you. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It considered each head of charge separately, bearing in mind that the burden of proof rests with the GDC and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is, whether the alleged facts are proved on the balance of probabilities.
45. The Committee's findings in relation to each head of charge are as follows:

1.	<p>Whilst enrolled on a dental implant nursing course:</p> <p>a. on 27 November 2022, at around 11:08, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;</p> <p>Found Proved</p>
----	---



The Committee noted from Witness 3's statement that you had enrolled on the dental implant course in question around March 2022. Witness 3, who was your tutor on the course, further stated that, as a requirement of the course you had to complete a record of competence, which would evidence the practical work you needed to carry out. This practical work had to be witnessed and signed off as completed by a qualified implant nurse or dentist. Witness 3 confirmed that the online platform that was used to upload the forms was called 'Pebble Pad'.

The Committee also had sight of a screenshot, which showed what is purported to be Witness 1's signature and confirmation that it was signed on 27 November 2022 at 11:08.

In his statement, Witness 1 stated that he had seen the screenshot and that:
'I confirm that I did not sign a witness feedback form on that date and the signature in image six is not my signature. I also confirm that I was not working on Sunday 27 November 2022 as I don't work on Sundays. I confirm that I did not witness the Registrant carry out a procedure on that day.'

You denied this head of charge. It is not disputed by you that you had enrolled on the dental implant course in question. Furthermore, in oral evidence, you accepted that you had uploaded the Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto Pebble Pad. You also accepted that you 'drew' Witness 1's signature in the required box. However, you stated that this was done as reminder to you as you did not consider the document to be an official document, but rather a working document that could be amended.

The Committee took all of this evidence into consideration. It is clear to the Committee and it is not disputed by you, that you uploaded the PCAS onto Pebble Pad, which included a signature that you produced of Witness 1. The Committee determined that the signature was a representation of Witness 1's signature, but written by you. The Committee noted Witness 1's evidence that you had done this without his permission and he had confirmed that the signature you had included was not his signature. The Committee concluded, therefore, that as Witness 1 had not authorised his signature to be used, you had falsified his signature on the document.

The Committee noted Witness 3's evidence that the document could not be amended once it had been uploaded onto Pebble Pad. It noted the following from her witness statement:

'Once a signature has been added to the form a learner cannot amend it.'

'The significance of the witness statement form is that the clinician has to sign off the form within two weeks of the student completing the procedure. The document is an official document that is used on Pebble Pad for the ROC and without it the account of the procedure is not valid. Therefore, a student would not be able to pass the course without having it completed.'

The Committee did not accept your account, which was to the effect that you had done this just as a reminder to yourself and that you did not believe that this was an official document. It noted from Witness 3's statement, that the document was used to confirm your competence in carrying out certain procedures and that it had to be signed off as complete by either a qualified dental nurse or dentist. The Committee concluded that it could not be considered a 'working' document and had been submitted by you as evidence of your practice as required by the course.



The Committee therefore, did not accept your explanation as plausible, and placed more weight on Witness 3's oral and written evidence, which it considered to be consistent and reliable.

Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved.

b. on 27 November 2022, at around 11:10, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;

Found Proved

The Committee had sight of a screenshot, which showed what is purported to be Witness 1's signature and confirmation that it was signed on 27 November 2022 at 11:10.

As in head of charge 1(a), Witness 1 has confirmed in his witness statement that he did not sign a witness feedback form on that date and the signature was not his signature.

You denied this head of charge for the same reasons as outlined at head of charge 1(a).

For the same reasons as above, the Committee found this head of charge proved.

c. on 27 November 2022, at around 20:02, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', that:

- i. contained a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;
- ii. suggested you had completed a dental activity called "maintenance study 2" on 28 November 2022;
- iii. suggested witness 1 had assessed and/or witnessed you completing "maintenance study 2" on 28 November 2022;

Found Proved

The Committee had sight of the relevant Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS). It noted that it included a signature, which is purported to be Witness 1's, and that it was dated 27 November 2022 at 20:02.

The Committee further noted that under the heading, 'Practical Competency', the word 'Maintenance' was highlighted in bold lettering. Furthermore, under the heading 'Professionalism Competency', the word 'Competent' had been highlighted, also in bold type.

In his witness statement, Witness 1 confirmed that he had not signed this PCAS. Furthermore, the Committee noted the following from his witness statement:

'It would be impossible for me to sign off procedures on 27 or 28 November 2022 as I was not working at the Practice on those dates. [Witness 5] had been provided a document from the course provider which she showed me. The document had Pebble Pad sign off screenshots with my name and my signature, however it was not my signature.'

You agreed during your oral evidence that you had uploaded this PCAS onto Pebble Pad and 'drew' Witness 1's signature. You also accepted that you highlighted the



	<p>words 'Maintenance' and 'Competent' on the PCAS. You stated that your reasons, as in all these heads of charge, were that you considered this to be a working document, not an official one, and that it could be amended at a later date.</p> <p>For the same reasons as above, the Committee did not accept your evidence. The Committee was satisfied that there was clear evidence from Witness 1 that he had not authorised you to use his signature and the highlighting of 'maintenance' and 'competence' suggested Witness 1 had agreed to this assessment. Furthermore, Witness 1 stated that he could not have witnessed you undertaking the procedures as he was not working on the relevant dates. The Committee accepted Witness 1's evidence, which has been read as agreed.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Committee found heads of charge 1(c) (i), (ii) and (iii) all proved.</p>
	<p>d. on 28 November 2022, at around 13:34, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;</p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee had sight of a screenshot, which showed what is purported to be Witness 1's signature and confirmation that it was signed on 28 November 2022 at 13:34.</p> <p>Witness 1 has confirmed in his witness statement that he did not sign a PCAS on that date and the signature was not his signature.</p> <p>You denied this head of charge for the same reasons as outlined at head of charge 1(a).</p> <p>For the same reasons as at head of charge 1(a), the Committee found this head of charge proved.</p>
	<p>e. on 28 November 2022, at around 13:45, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1;</p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee had sight of a screenshot, which showed what is purported to be Witness 1's signature and confirmation that it was signed on 28 November 2022 at 13:45.</p> <p>Witness 1 has confirmed in his witness statement that he did not sign a PCAS on that date and the signature was not his signature.</p> <p>You denied this head of charge for the same reasons as outlined at head of charge 1(a).</p> <p>For the same reasons as at head of charge 1(a), the Committee found this head of charge proved.</p>
	<p>f. on 28 November 2022, at around 13:57, you uploaded a Practical Competence Assessment Sheet (PCAS) onto an online platform called 'PebblePad', containing a falsified signature, in the name of Witness 1.</p>

	<p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee had sight of a screenshot, which showed what is purported to be Witness 1’s signature and confirmation that it was signed on 28 November 2022 at 13:57.</p> <p>Witness 1 has confirmed in his witness statement that he did not sign a PCAS on that date and the signature was not his signature.</p> <p>You denied this head of charge for the same reasons as outlined at head of charge 1(a).</p> <p>For the same reasons as at head of charge 1(a), the Committee found this head of charge proved.</p>
2.	<p>Your conduct in Charge 1.a) and/or 1.b) and/or 1.c)i. and/or 1.d) and/or 1.e) and/or 1.f) was:</p> <p>a. misleading;</p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>When considering this head of charge, the Committee applied the ordinary English definition of misleading, which was whether an informed and reasonable person would be led into believing that something was what it appeared to be, when in fact that was not the case. The Committee further noted that this was an objective test, and that it did not rely on whether the person concerned had intended to mislead.</p> <p>The Committee determined that by falsifying Witness 1’s signature on the PCASs that you uploaded onto PebblePad, you had led Witness 2 and Witness 3 to believe that Witness 1 had signed you off as competent in the relevant areas when this was not true.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Committee found this head of charge proved for all of 1(a), 1(b), 1(c)(i), 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f).</p> <p>b. lacking in integrity;</p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee has found proved that you had falsified Witness 1’s signature and misled Witness 2 and Witness 3 into believing that you had successfully completed the required procedures for the dental implant course when you had not.</p> <p>The Committee determined that this conduct did not constitute appropriate or ethical behaviour for a professional person registered with the GDC.</p> <p>Therefore, the Committee found proved that your conduct lacked integrity for all of heads of charge 1(a),1(b), 1(c)(i), 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f).</p> <p>c. dishonest – in that you knew the PCAS you uploaded contained a falsified signature.</p>



Found Proved

When considering this charge, the Committee referred to the test set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd. t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67. It first considered the actual state of your knowledge or belief as to the facts at the time. The Committee then considered whether your conduct would be viewed as dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary and decent people.

The Committee noted your oral evidence that you believed that the PCAS was not an official document, but rather a working document that could be amended after it had been uploaded onto the Pebble Pad. You accepted that you 'drew' Witness 1's signature, but stated that you only did this as a reminder. You therefore denied that your actions were dishonest.

The Committee considered that the timeline of events was important in determining your likely motivation for your actions. It noted your email correspondence with Witness 3, dated 26 and 27 November 2022. Witness 3 had emailed you with her concerns that you may not have been able to complete the course before the deadline of the end of December 2022. Witness 3 suggested that you could defer taking your exam to a later date and a fee would be payable if you did so.

You responded to the email on 27 November 2022 by stating, '*Sorry I need to finish the course. The course is expensive for me. [xxx] is not paying for this fee*'.

In your oral evidence you were also clear that you had not wanted to defer taking the exam at a later date owing to the further costs. You repeatedly explained that this was because you were paying for the course yourself as the practice had not paid for it.

The Committee noted that you uploaded the PCAS forms on to the PebblePad on 27 and 28 November 2022, which was around the same time as your email correspondence with Witness 3 in relation to completion of the course.

The Committee noted that you then emailed Witness 3 on 28 November 2022 to inform her that you had completed your RoC.

Based on this timeline of events, the Committee considered that it would have been clear to you at the time you uploaded the forms that you had not completed all of the required procedures. This had taken place around the same time that Witness 3 had raised her concerns with you that you would not complete the course on time. Furthermore, Witness 1 has confirmed that he did not witness any of the procedures on either 27 or 28 November 2022 as he was not working on those days.

The Committee did not accept your explanation that you believed these documents could be amended after they had been uploaded as they were not official documents. It was clear to the Committee that your email to Witness 3 stated that you had completed your RoC and it has determined that these documents were clearly submitted as final assessed documents, which purported to be signed by Witness 1 as complete. The Committee further noted and accepted Witness 3's evidence that, '*The document is an official document that is used on Pebble Pad for the ROC and without it the account of the procedure is not valid...*'.

Additionally, you must have been aware that Witness 1 could not have observed the procedures you had stated had taken place on 27 and 28 November 2022, as he had not been working at the practice on those days.



	<p>It appeared to the Committee that you did not appreciate the seriousness of falsifying Witness 1's signature as you had repeatedly stated that you "<i>didn't kill anybody with the workbook</i>". It was also clear from your oral evidence that you were dissatisfied with various aspects of the course. Furthermore, the Committee noted from your oral evidence that you appeared to have a disregard for the importance of practice learning as part of the course, in that you told the Committee you had extensive experience at another practice with the competencies required for this course. You stated that the workbook did not provide practice knowledge.</p> <p>Taking all of this into consideration, and notwithstanding your previous good character, the Committee determined that it was more likely than not that you were aware that the PCAS was an official document that could not be amended after it had been uploaded. It determined therefore, that you had made a deliberate decision to falsify Witness 1's signature in order that you could complete the course on time and not have to pay any additional fees.</p> <p>The Committee determined that this would be considered dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary and decent people.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved for all of heads of charge 1(a),1(b), 1(c)(i), 1(d), 1(e) and 1(f).</p>
3.	<p>Your conduct in Charge 1.c)ii was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. misleading;b. lacking in integrity;c. dishonest – in that you knew you had not yet completed the activity listed. <p>Found Proved in its entirety</p> <p>For the same reasons as set out at heads of charge 2(a), (b) and (c), the Committee determined that your conduct in head of charge 1(c) (ii) was misleading, lacking in integrity and dishonest.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved in its entirety.</p>
4.	<p>Your conduct in Charge 1.c.)iii was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. misleading;b. lacking in integrity;c. dishonest – in that you knew Witness 1 had not assessed and/or witnessed you complete the activity listed on 28 November 2022. <p>Found Proved in its entirety</p> <p>For the same reasons as set out at head of charge 2(a), (b) and (c), the Committee determined that your conduct in head of charge 1(c) (iii) was misleading, lacking in integrity and dishonest.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved in its entirety.</p>
5.	<p>Between 13 December 2022 and 28 March 2024 you sent emails containing the comments contained in Schedule A to Witness 2.</p>



	<p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee noted that in your oral evidence that you accepted you had sent the emails contained in Schedule A to Witness 2. The Committee also noted Witness 2's statement in which she confirmed she had received the emails.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved.</p>
6.	<p>Your conduct in relation to Charge 5 was inappropriate and/or unprofessional in respect of items 1, and/or 2, and/or 3, and/or 4, and/or 5, and/or 6, and/or 7, and/or 8, and/or 9, and/or 10, listed in Schedule A.</p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee considered the emails you had sent to Witness 2 as contained in Schedule A. It noted that the emails were sent during the period, 13 December 2022 to 28 March 2024.</p> <p>It noted that you had accused Witness 3, in your emails to Witness 2, of being a <i>'proper scammer'</i> as you had not received a full refund for the course. In particular, the Committee noted your email of 21 August 2023:</p> <p><i>'As you know that my reputation was affected because of your poor service and your useless tutor you have to refund me £36, 700. In this amount are included 18 months suspension, tax free for the course and book. I am afraid that your tutor is a proper scammer. She providing very poor useless tutoring. Kindly recommend you to speak with her and transfer the amount in my account'.</i></p> <p>The Committee noted that you denied that your conduct was inappropriate or unprofessional. You stated in oral evidence that you believed that you were justified in sending the emails as you were completely dissatisfied with the way in which the course was delivered. In particular, you were critical of the tutor (Witness 3) having a nose piercing, claiming this was unprofessional, and that the tutor spent time talking about the weather and people's personal lives.</p> <p>The Committee noted your explanation. However, there was no independent evidence to suggest that the course was not delivered professionally. Indeed, the available emails suggested that Witness 3 had done her best to assist you. In the Committee's judgment, there was no justification for sending the emails to Witness 2 that you accepted you had sent. The Committee also noted the quantity of emails sent and that the first email was sent on the same day that you were removed from the course following an investigation by the practice which found that you had falsified Witness 1's signature.</p> <p>The Committee considered that the emails you sent amounted to a personal attack on Witness 3. You accused her of being a <i>'scammer'</i> and asserted that she is <i>'harming [Witness 2's] students with unprofessional behaviour and reputation of [Witness 2's] company'</i>. You also described her as, <i>'absolutely unhelpful, unprofessional and useless tutor'</i>.</p> <p>The Committee considered that if you were dissatisfied with the course, then there would have been appropriate and measured ways of dealing with this, such as going through a formal complaints procedure or seeking financial compensation through a legal process.</p>



	<p>Taking all of this into consideration therefore, the Committee determined that your conduct was not justifiable or proper in the circumstances and amounted to inappropriate and unprofessional conduct.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved.</p>
7.	<p>Between 5 May 2023 and 16 August 2023 you sent emails containing the comments contained in Schedule B to Witness 3.</p> <p>Found Proved</p> <p>The Committee noted that in your oral evidence that you accepted you had sent the emails contained in Schedule B to Witness 3. The Committee also noted Witness 3's statement in which she confirmed she had received the emails.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved.</p>
8.	<p>Your conduct in relation to Charge 7 was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. inappropriate and/or unprofessional in respect of items 1, and/or 2, and/or 3, and/or 4, and/or 5, and or 6, listed in Schedule B;b. intimidating and/or threatening in respect of items 2, and/or 3, and/or 4, and/or 5, and/or 6, listed in schedule B. <p>Found Proved in its Entirety</p> <p>The Committee carefully considered the emails in Schedule B.</p> <p>The Committee noted that you had sent Witness 3 six emails between 5 May 2023 and 16 August 2023. It noted that one email had been sent at 1:49 a.m. on 16 August 2023. The Committee also noted that the email on 16 August 2023 contained a threat to Witness 3 and her family: <i>'Until you do not send me that money I wish you all the bad things in the world for your and your family...'</i></p> <p>The Committee noted the effect your emails had on Witness 3. In oral evidence, Witness 3 stated that she was traumatised and troubled by your emails. She stated that she was concerned that she would be tracked down by you and she interpreted the emails as a warning. Witness 3 stated that she was deeply concerned about what you would do next.</p> <p>The Committee noted that such was Witness 2 and Witness 3's concerns that Witness 2 reported you to the police, who subsequently contacted you by email and told you to stop contacting both Witness 2 and Witness 3. However, despite this warning, you contacted Witness 2 again by email on 28 March 2024.</p> <p>Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee determined that your conduct was inappropriate and unprofessional for the same reasons as set out at head of charge 6.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Committee took into account the emails you sent to Witness 3, by way of example the email sent on 16 August 2023 at 01:49, amounted to intimidating and threatening behaviour towards Witness 3.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee found this head of charge proved in its entirety.</p>

41. We now move to Stage 2.

Fitness to practise and sanction

42. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee then moved on to consider whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct and, if so, whether your practice is currently impaired.
43. The Committee heard submissions from Mr Stevens, on behalf of the GDC, and from you in relation to the matters of misconduct, impairment and sanction.
44. The Committee also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the powers and principles to be considered in coming to its decisions in relation to misconduct, impairment, and sanction.

Evidence

45. The Committee had regard to a further bundle of documents, which included:
- Continuing Professional Development (CPD) certificates;
 - Personal Development Plan;
 - References; and
 - Emails between you and the GDC, containing two reflective statements.

Submissions

46. Mr Stevens, on behalf of the GDC, told the Committee that you have no previous fitness to practise history. He submitted that there is no evidential standard that must be applied to its consideration of misconduct. He stated that it is a matter of collective judgement for the Committee as to whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct. Whilst there is no definition, he referred the Committee to the case of *Nandi v General Medical Council* [2004] EWHC 2317 (Admin) in which misconduct was referred to as '*a falling short by omission or commission of the standards of conduct expected among medical practitioners, and such falling short must be serious*'.
47. Mr Stevens referred the Committee to the GDC document, '*Standards for the Dental Team*' and detailed which Standards the GDC considers you have breached. He submitted that whilst this is not a clinical case, it is not a case that is divorced from any risk of harm to patients and submitted that the conduct still raises serious concerns of an attitudinal nature that is capable of a future risk of harm to patients. To assist the Committee, he referred it to the GDC document, '*Guidance for the Practice Committees including Indicative Sanctions Guidance*', (the ISG), in particular paragraphs 59 and 60 in relation to your dishonest conduct. Mr Stevens submitted that the dishonesty found proved in this case, particularly when considering the detail and context of the facts found proved, is so serious that the Committee can comfortably make a finding of misconduct.
48. On the matter of impairment, Mr Stevens invited the Committee to consider whether your misconduct currently impairs your fitness to practise. He submitted that the Committee may wish to consider whether your misconduct is remediable, whether it has been remedied, whether you have demonstrated insight, and to assess the risk of repetition.
49. Mr Stevens submitted that there are real public protection concerns in this case resulting from the entrenched attitudinal failings and the marked absence of any insight into your own wrongdoing. He stated that this was characterised by a continued insistence that you are the victim of wrongdoing, not the perpetrator. Mr Stevens submitted that there was an indication of financial motivation and that your conduct included a degree of sophistication, not a momentary lapse of judgement which points to an ingrained attitudinal issue.

50. Mr Stevens invited the Committee to comfortably conclude that there is no insight in this case and there remains a risk of repetition requiring a finding of current impairment on the ground of public protection. In addition, due to the breach of fundamental tenets and having brought the profession into disrepute, Mr Stevens submitted that a finding of current impairment is also required on the ground of public interest in order to maintain public confidence and to uphold proper professional standards.
51. On the matter of sanction, Mr Stevens took the Committee through what the GDC consider to be the mitigating and aggravating features in this case. He submitted that it is the GDC's view that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is one of erasure and that anything less would not adequately address the public protection and public interest concerns raised.
52. You informed the Committee that you have been accused of dishonesty, misleading conduct, and a lack of integrity but asserted that you do not accept this and attributed the blame to the GDC's witnesses. You stated that the documents found to have been falsified with forged signatures were not official documents and made accusations regarding the professionalism of the course tutor and training provider. You further stated that you found yourself working in a practice with poor management and unhelpful staff and have since become a victim of circumstance that has led to this.
53. You said that you have been a dental nurse for many years and have had good feedback, that you have not '*killed any patients*', and have never been dishonest with anyone, including your patients. You referred the Committee to the CPD certificates and references you have provided and that you have continued on your professional development despite the GDC's attempts to '*put you down*'. It was your opinion that the conduct that you continue to dispute would not happen again and that previous patients still stop you in the street as you are a professional.
54. You disputed Mr Stevens' submission that your conduct was financially motivated and stated that due to the interim suspension order, not only have you been financially affected but that patients have been deprived of a competent dental nurse. You stated that patients' need should be put first and that it would be in the public interest to allow you to return to practise.

Decision and reasons on misconduct

55. The Committee noted that the conduct in this case fell into three distinct behaviours: falsifying signatures, submitting documentation claiming you had completed practical competency assessments when you had not, and sending emails that were inappropriate, unprofessional, intimidating, and threatening.
56. The Committee was satisfied that you have breached the following Standards:

Standard 1.3: *You must be honest and act with integrity*

1.3.1 *You must justify the trust that patients, the public and your colleagues place in you by always acting honestly and fairly in your dealings with them. This applies to any business or education activities in which you are involved as well as to your professional dealings.*

1.3.2 *You must make sure you do not bring the profession into disrepute*

Standard 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*

57. The Committee was mindful of the principle that not every departure from required standards will be sufficiently serious to amount to misconduct and that such a departure must be sufficiently serious to be characterised properly as misconduct going to fitness to practise.
58. The Committee found your falsification of documents and submissions of false signatures to be calculated and deliberate attempts to deceive. The Committee considered that had your conduct gone undetected, it would have resulted in you gaining a qualification for which you did not have the requisite skills, knowledge or competence. This was not only a blatant disregard for the training provider's system in place for assessing clinical competency, and may also have resulted in a risk of actual harm to patients were you then to be working outside of your scope of practice. Further, this may have led to financial gain by way of employment opportunities for which you were not entitled. In addition, the Committee noted that had you not completed your course in the allotted time frame, there would have been financial implications for you in that you would have been required to pay further fees to complete the course. In this regard, the Committee was satisfied that this entailed a degree of sophistication and could not be considered to be a momentary lapse of judgement but that this was an indication of an attitudinal issue which was a serious breach of trust, not only of the course provider and tutor but to any potential future employers and of the public.
59. In its consideration of the emails sent to Witness 2 and Witness 3, the Committee noted that the emails were of a nature that resulted in you being reported to the police and you were advised to not contact those witnesses again. The Committee was satisfied that, having heard from Witness 3, your conduct resulted in actual psychological harm. This was a clear and serious breach of the fundamental tenets of the profession, and such actions would bring the dental profession into disrepute.
60. For all these reasons, the Committee was satisfied that your conduct fell far below the standards expected of a registered professional and was so serious that there was no doubt it amounted to misconduct.

Decision and reasons on impairment

61. The Committee then went on to consider whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found. In doing so, the Committee has again exercised its independent judgement. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has borne in mind that its primary duty is to address the public interest, which includes the protection of patients, 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.
62. The Committee considered whether the misconduct in this case is remediable, whether it had been remedied, and the risk of repetition, and had regard to the 'test' detailed in the case of *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin).
63. The Committee accepted Mr Stevens' submission that entrenched attitudinal failings are by their very nature less easily remedied than discreet areas of clinical practice. In this regard, the Committee carefully considered your oral submissions and the documentation you have provided today in order to determine whether there has been any remediation.
64. Two reflective statements were provided by you, dated 16 June and 31 August 2025. Within your statement dated 16 June 2025, you stated that, despite the Committee's findings, you '*categorically deny falsifying any signature*' and continued to assert your position that the practice workbook was not an official document and that, '*The signature in question appears on work book as a reminder for me.*' You stated that at no time did you intend to deceive and are committed to upholding the Standards by which the dental profession is governed. You acknowledged the seriousness of what you refer to as 'allegations' and that any errors were mistakes on your part, declaring that you are prepared to undertake any corrective steps.

65. In your statement dated 31 August 2025, some two months after the first, you stated that you had worked hard to reflect on your actions and had undertaken CPD as a *'corrective step'*. You stated:

'Through this process, I have developed a much deeper understanding of why the concerns are and what I needed to change. I recognise the impact this had on patients, the profession, and public confidence, and I am truly sorry for that.'

66. However, this assertion was contradicted in your oral evidence, where you told the Committee that you did not consider that you have done anything wrong and continued to blame the GDC's witnesses, refusing to take any accountability for your own actions. The Committee could not attribute any weight to any CPD undertaken without you having demonstrated any understanding of wrongdoing or acceptance of responsibility for your actions, nor was it targeted at your professional failings.
67. You have not at any point in either your written reflections or your oral submissions today addressed the emails that you sent or the impact these may have had on the recipients.
68. You told the Committee that you considered the public interest was deprived of a capable professional whilst you have been suspended from practice and that all you have done wrong was working in a practice that was poorly managed and with staff who were rude to you for two years.
69. The Committee concluded that you have demonstrated a complete lack of insight into your conduct and have not demonstrated any recognition of the seriousness of the facts found proved. The Committee found the apology in your written reflection to be spurious, noting that you have been intent on blaming others for your failings throughout the entire hearing. Your oral submissions today focused on your persistent accusations of unprofessional behaviour on the part of the course tutor and training provider, and you did not accept any responsibility for the facts found proved.
70. In the complete absence of any insight, there was no reassurance that any risk of repetition has been mitigated. On the contrary, the Committee considered the persistent lack of insight to be evidence of a real risk of repetition.
71. Therefore, a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.
72. The Committee bore in mind its overarching objective to maintain public confidence in the profession and upholding standards. In this regard, the Committee considered that a fair-minded and fully informed member of the public would expect a finding of impairment in a case where a registrant has failed to demonstrate insight into the dishonesty findings or accept any responsibility for any wrongdoing. Further, this Committee had grave concerns about the risk of repetition as, due to the deep-seated attitudinal behaviours demonstrated, it was highly likely that such conduct would be repeated in the future. As a result, the public would be horrified to learn that the Committee had not made a finding of impairment and allowed you to return to unrestricted practice.
73. Accordingly, the Committee concluded that public confidence would be undermined in the profession, and in the GDC as its regulator, if a finding of impairment were not made in a case where a registrant had falsified official documentation in order to obtain a qualification for which they were not suitably proficient, and where intimidating and threatening emails had been sent in the early hours of the morning to those connected to the delivery of training required to obtain the qualification sought.
74. In this regard, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise is impaired on the ground of public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction

75. In coming to its decision on sanction, the Committee considered what action, if any, to take in relation to your registration. It took into account the GDC's document *'Guidance for the Practice Committees,*

including *Indicative Sanctions Guidance 2016 (ISG)* (revised December 2020). The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate and appropriate and, although not intended to be punitive, may have that effect.

76. The Committee took into account the following aggravating features:
- actual harm to Witness 3 and risk of harm to a patient or another;
 - dishonesty;
 - premeditated misconduct;
 - financial gain;
 - breach of trust;
 - misconduct sustained or repeated over a period of time; and
 - lack of insight.
77. The Committee also took into account the following mitigating features:
- evidence of previous good character.
78. The Committee had regard to its previous findings on misconduct and impairment in coming to its decision and considered each sanction in ascending order of severity.
79. The Committee first considered whether to take no further action or to issue a reprimand but concluded that this would be inappropriate in view of the seriousness of the conduct in this case. The Committee did not consider the conduct to be at the lower end of the spectrum and therefore it would be neither proportionate nor in the public interest to allow you to return to practice without some form of restriction in place.
80. The Committee next considered whether placing conditions on your registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. Due to the lack of insight shown and the high risk of repetition, the Committee could not be satisfied that you would be willing to comply with conditional registration. Further, it was of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated given the nature of the misconduct identified. In addition, it did not consider that conditions would adequately address the public interest in this case given the seriousness of the misconduct found.
81. The Committee then went on to consider whether a suspension would be the appropriate sanction. The ISG states suspension may be suitable where most of the following factors are present:
- there is evidence of repetition of the behaviour;
 - you have not shown insight and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour;
 - patients' interests would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;
 - public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;
 - there is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems.
82. The misconduct in this case was a serious and significant departure from the standards expected of a dental nurse. The Committee determined that due to the serious breach of fundamental tenets set out in the Standards, the persistent deflection of blame, the complete lack of acceptance of your own conduct and the total lack of insight that suspension would not adequately address the public protection issues identified or satisfy the public interest in the matter.
83. In considering erasure, the ISG states removal from the Register may be suitable where most of the following factors are present:
- serious departure(s) from the relevant professional standards;
 - where serious harm to patients or other persons has occurred, either deliberately or ...;

- where a continuing risk of serious harm to patients or other persons is identified;
- the abuse of a position of trust ...;
- serious dishonesty, particularly where persistent or covered up;
- a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of actions or their consequences.

84. Balancing all these factors, the Committee determined that such features were present in this case and therefore it directs your name be removed from the Register. The Committee was of the view that the findings in this case demonstrate a serious, deliberate, and persistent departure from the professional standards and that allowing you to remain on the Register would seriously undermine public confidence in the profession. Erasure is the only sanction that would appropriately address the misconduct in this case and send the public and the profession a clear message about the standards expected of a dental nurse. To adequately protect the public, nothing short of removal from the register would be sufficient.
85. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether a suspension order should take immediate effect to cover the 28-day appeal period.

Decision on immediate order

86. The order of erasure does not come into effect until the end of the appeal period or, if an appeal is lodged, until it has been disposed of. The appeal period expires 28 days after the date on which the notification of the determination is served on you. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in this regard.

Submissions

87. Mr Stevens informed the Committee that during the course of the GDC's investigation, you were made subject to an interim suspension order and that this now falls away following the Committee's substantive decision. In order to cover the appeal period before the erasure takes effect, Mr Stevens made an application for an immediate suspension to be imposed on your registration on the grounds of both public protection and public interest.
88. You did not make any submissions.

Decision and reasons on immediate order

89. The Committee was satisfied that an immediate order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest; to do otherwise would be incompatible with the Committee's earlier findings.
90. The existing interim suspension order that has been in place is hereby revoked and due to the Committee's reasons for ordering your erasure from the Register, it determined that an immediate suspension is the only appropriate outcome and acceded to Mr Steven's application.
91. The immediate suspension will remain in place until any appeal is disposed of or, if no appeal is lodged, the erasure will replace the immediate order 28 days after you have been sent notification of this decision in writing in accordance with the Act.
92. That concludes this determination.