

## PUBLIC HEARING

### Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

12 June 2026

**Name:** BANWAIT, Prabjit Singh

**Registration number:** 192102

**Case number:** CAS-210082-F7R9Z6

---

**General Dental Council:** Natalie Bird, Counsel.  
Instructed by Naila Hadid, IHLPS

**Registrant:** Present  
Unrepresented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Not Impaired by reason of misconduct

**Outcome:** Fitness to practice no longer impaired. Suspension revoked.

---

**Committee members:** Debbie Jones (Dental Care Professional) (Chair)  
Caitriona Gerber Walsh (Dentist)  
Jane Jones (Lay)

**Legal adviser:** Alex Coleman

**Committee Secretary:** Andrew Keeling

---

Mr Banwait,

1. This was a review hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) in accordance with Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing was for this PCC to review your case and determine what action to take in relation to your registration.
2. You were present at the hearing, but you were not represented. Miss Natalie Bird, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

## Background

3. Your case was first considered by a PCC at a hearing which took place between 16 and 18 December 2025. You attended the hearing, but you were not not represented.
4. At that initial hearing, it was found proved that, based on your admission, you failed to disclose the police caution you received on 10 April 2007 when applying for GDC registration on 1 May 2010 (received by the GDC on 16 June 2010). On the application form for registration, you ticked 'no' to the question of whether you had received a caution. You admitted that this conduct was misleading. The Committee also found that your conduct was dishonest in that you knowingly did not declare your caution to the GDC despite knowing that you were required to do so.
5. That Committee found proved that your misleading and dishonest behaviour amounted to misconduct. It also found that your fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of your misconduct, on public interest grounds only, for the following reasons:

*'The Committee then went on to consider the level of your insight into your dishonest conduct. It gave careful consideration to the character references you submitted and the oral evidence it heard. It noted that you apologised to the GDC for your actions and were remorseful. The Committee considered your oral evidence and noted that you were consistent and honest throughout the hearing when explaining your reasons for your dishonest behaviour and that you now understood and accepted the Committee's findings. The Committee also noted your admissions at the start of the hearing, including your acceptance that your conduct was misleading. Furthermore, it noted that there has been no repetition of your dishonest conduct since the incident in 2010.*

*However, the Committee was of the view that you did not sufficiently address the impact of your dishonest conduct on either the GDC, the dental professions or the wider public. The Committee noted that your submissions and evidence were focused more on patient safety and that you been practising ethically and safely with few complaints since you qualified. In the Committee's view you did not fully address the effect of your conduct on the GDC's role in ensuring the reliability and integrity of the register and how this could undermine the public's confidence in the profession and its regulation. Therefore, whilst you reassured the Committee that any repetition of your dishonesty was unlikely, which the Committee accepted, the Committee considered that your insight into your misconduct in respect of the wider public interest was still developing.*

*In conclusion, considering the developing nature of your insight and the serious nature of your dishonest conduct, the Committee determined that a finding of impairment is necessary in the wider public interest, to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold proper standards of conduct. The Committee has*

*concluded that a reasonable and informed member of the public would have their confidence in the profession and the regulator undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in a case where you had been dishonest to your regulator in order to obtain registration by knowingly and wilfully not declaring a caution when clearly required to do so.'*

6. That Committee directed that your name should be suspended from the Register for a period of six months, with a review to take place before the expiry of the order. It considered that an order of suspension would *'sufficiently mark the seriousness of your dishonest conduct and was the least restrictive sanction to maintain public confidence in the dental profession and to declare and uphold appropriate standards of conduct among dental professionals'*.
7. Furthermore, that Committee indicated that the Committee reviewing the order may be assisted by the following:
  - *A written reflective document to show that you fully understand the impact of your dishonest behaviour on the GDC, the dental professions and the wider public interest; and*
  - *Any further testimonials or character references.*

## Today's Review

8. It was the role of the Committee today to undertake a comprehensive review of this case. In so doing, the Committee had careful regard to all the documentary evidence before it and took account of the submissions made by both parties. The Committee also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees* (6 January 2026) ("*the Guidance*").
9. Miss Bird submitted that the GDC is neutral on the question of impairment. She submitted that you have provided a reflective statement in which you acknowledge the seriousness of your misconduct and the potential impact on the public and the dental profession. She submitted that the GDC acknowledges that your misconduct was an isolated matter which occurred 16 years ago in respect of a police caution which is now 19 years old. She submitted that there has been no repetition of your behaviour or any other additional concerns raised, and that you have now served your six month suspension.
10. You submitted that you understand that the GDC relies upon honest disclosure on applications and that your failure to disclose your police caution risked damaging public confidence in the dental professions as a whole. You submitted that you understand that a failure to disclose a caution to the GDC could break the trust between dentists and patients, which could lead to patients not seeking dental care and remaining in pain rather than seeking help.

11. You submitted that, going forward, you would immediately inform the GDC if you received another police caution (albeit you stated that this was unlikely) and would seek professional help. If you could go back to your application and tick the correct box you would do so and you apologised for not declaring your caution on your initial application.
12. You submitted that you do not believe that your fitness to practise is currently impaired. You submitted that you are a hard-working and ethical dentist, who always provides patients with a full list of options. You submitted that you have predominantly worked in NHS practices and would like to remain working in the NHS. You submitted that you hope the Committee can see and trust that you would do the right thing if any similar issues arise in the future.
13. In response to a question from the Committee, you stated that you have not undertaken any verifiable Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training in the previous six months. However, you stated that you have been reading journals online and have been keeping up-to-date with any changes in the profession.

### **Decision on Current Impairment**

14. In making its decision, the Committee first sought to determine whether your fitness to practise was currently impaired by reason of your misconduct. It exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decision of the previous committee. It balanced your interests with those of the public and bore in mind that its primary duty is to protect the public, including maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour.
15. The Committee considered your written reflections document and your oral submissions today. It took into account that your misconduct is remediable and that the finding of the substantive Committee was that your insight did not sufficiently address the impact of your dishonest conduct on either the GDC, the dental professions or the wider public. The Committee was satisfied that you have now fully addressed these issues. You acknowledged the gravity of your misconduct and the impact this could have on the GDC, the dental profession as a whole and the wider public interest. In particular, the Committee noted from your reflections document the following, which clearly showed that you understood the importance of disclosing any police cautions to the GDC:

*'I appreciate it was not for me to decide whether the caution was relevant. That decision rests solely with the regulator, and it was my responsibility to fully disclose the caution.'*

16. Furthermore, the Committee noted that your dishonest misconduct was an isolated matter, which took place 16 years ago and there has been no repetition of any concerns. The Committee was satisfied that any repetition of your dishonest conduct was unlikely.
17. Accordingly, the Committee has concluded that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired by reason of your misconduct. In the Committee's view, a finding of current impairment is no longer required in the public interest to maintain public confidence in the profession or to declare and uphold appropriate standards of conduct among dental professionals. It considered that a well-informed member of the public would consider that you have shown full insight into your misconduct and that these matters have now been fully remediated.
18. Accordingly, for all these reasons, the Committee determined, pursuant to Section 27C(1)(a) of the Dentists Act 1984, as amended, to terminate the suspension order with immediate effect.
19. That concludes this hearing today.