

HEARING HELD IN PUBLIC

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

4 to 6 March 2026

Name: SCOTT, Sarah-Jayne Sandra Annie

Registration number: 269810

Case number: CAS-209157-Y0Q8C3

General Dental Council: Rebecca Vanstone, Counsel
Instructed by Georgina Mayles, IHLPS

Registrant: Not Present
Not Represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of conviction

Outcome: Erased with Immediate Suspension

Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Gregory Heath (Chair, Dentist Member)
Alan McCrum (Lay Member)
Clare Mcilwaine (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal Adviser: Charles Apthorp

Committee Secretary: Lola Bird

Sarah-Jayne Sandra Annie SCOTT, a dental nurse, Diploma in Dental Nursing & Level 3 QCF City & Guilds 2017 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 4 March 2026 for an inquiry into the following charge:

The Charge

'That being a registered dental care professional:

1. *On 21 March 2024, you were convicted at Bradford Crown Court of an offence of assault occasioning actual bodily harm on 03 March 2023, contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.*

AND by reason of the matter set out above, your fitness to practice is impaired by reason of conviction.'

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee in respect of a case brought by the General Dental Council (GDC) against Mrs Scott. The charge concerns Mrs Scott's conviction on 21 March 2024.

2. The hearing commenced today, 4 March 2026, and is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.

3. Mrs Scott is not present at these proceedings, and she is not represented in her absence. The Case Presenter for the GDC is Ms Rebecca Vanstone, Counsel.

Preliminary Matters: Application to proceed in the absence of the registrant

4. At the outset, Ms Vanstone made an application under Rule 54 of the *GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006* ('the Rules') to proceed with the hearing notwithstanding Mrs Scott's absence.

5. As required, Ms Vanstone first addressed the Committee on the issue of service and whether Mrs Scott had been duly notified of the hearing in accordance with the Rules. Ms Vanstone drew the Committee's attention to a copy of the Notice of Hearing dated 28 January 2026 ('the notice'), which was sent to Mrs Scott's registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post. A copy of the notice was also sent to Mrs Scott by email on 28 January 2026. It was Ms Vanstone's submission that service had been properly effected in accordance with the Rules.

6. In inviting the Committee to proceed with the hearing in Mrs Scott's absence, Ms Vanstone referred to an email received by the GDC from Mrs Scott dated 29 January 2026, in which Mrs Scott stated "*I have recieved [sic] the numerous papers regarding the meetings which seems unnecessary.*

Once again I am having to tell you, I will not be attending any hearings or meetings regarding this matter again. I have no other input to bring forward, that is any different from when this process started 3 years ago...". Ms Vanstone submitted that it was clear that Mrs Scott is aware of this hearing and that she has chosen not to attend. Ms Vanstone stated that there would be no useful purpose in adjourning the proceedings in the circumstances. She submitted that it would be in the public interest and in Mrs Scott's own interests for this case to be brought to a conclusion. It was Ms Vanstone's submission that it would be fair and in the interests of justice to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mrs Scott.

7. In reaching its decisions on the issues of service and proceeding in the absence of Mrs Scott, the Committee took account of Ms Vanstone's submissions and the relevant documentation brought to its attention. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to both service and proceeding with a hearing in the absence of a registrant.

Decision on service – 4 March 2026

8. The Committee considered whether notice had been served on Mrs Scott in accordance with Rules 13 and 65. It had sight of the notice dated 28 January 2026, which was sent to her registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post. A copy was also sent to her by email. The Committee took into account that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove receipt of the notice, only that it was sent. However, the Committee had before it a copy of a Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' receipt confirming that the copy of the notice sent to Mrs Scott by Special Delivery was delivered and signed for on 29 January 2026 by 'S J Scott' with the printed name of 'SARAH'. The Committee also took into account that Mrs Scott corresponded with the GDC by email on that same day, 29 January 2026.

9. The Committee was satisfied that the notice sent to Mrs Scott complied with the 28-day notice period specified in the Rules. It was also satisfied that the notice contained all the required particulars, including the date and time of the hearing, confirmation that the hearing would be conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams, and that the Committee had the power to proceed in Mrs Scott's absence.

10. On the basis of all the information provided, the Committee was satisfied that Mrs Scott was duly notified of this hearing in accordance with the Rules.

Decision on whether to proceed in the absence of the registrant – 4 March 2026

11. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mrs Scott. It approached this issue with the utmost care and caution. The Committee took account of the factors relevant to its decision, as set out in the case of *R v Jones* [2002] UKHL 5, and as affirmed in subsequent regulatory cases.

12. The Committee bore in mind that fairness to Mrs Scott is an important consideration. It also took into account the need to be fair to the GDC, as well the duty of the Committee to act expeditiously in the public interest.

13. The Committee was satisfied from Mrs Scott's email of 29 January 2026 that she is aware of this hearing. It considered it clear that she has chosen not to attend and was therefore satisfied that her absence is voluntary. In light of this, the Committee concluded that adjourning the hearing today would serve no meaningful purpose. It received no indication from Mrs Scott that deferring these proceedings would secure her attendance on a future date. The Committee noted that in her email of 29 January 2026 she stated in respect of this matter that she could not "*wait for it to be over*".

14. In all the circumstances, it was the view of the Committee that it would be fair, in the public interest and in Mrs Scott's own interests to proceed with the hearing in her absence.

The GDC's opening submissions

15. In opening the case for the GDC, Ms Vanstone stated that the allegation against Mrs Scott concerns her conviction on 21 March 2024 at Bradford Crown Court of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, with that offence having occurred on 3 March 2023.

16. Ms Vanstone highlighted that the certificate of conviction in respect of Mrs Scott is before the Committee. Ms Vanstone also referred to the copy of the Police National Computer (PNC) disclosure record which, she stated, shows the date of the offence and the date of the conviction.

17. Ms Vanstone submitted that there is conclusive evidence of Mrs Scott's conviction, and she invited the Committee to find the matter proved. In doing so, she referred the Committee to Rule 57(5) of the Rules, which deals with evidence in relation to criminal offences.

18. Ms Vanstone submitted that at this stage of the proceedings (Stage 1), the Committee is only concerned with determining the alleged fact of Mrs Scott's conviction. Ms Vanstone stated that, if the Committee found this factual matter proved, she would address the circumstances that led to the conviction at the next stage of the hearing (Stage 2).

The Committee's finding of fact – 4 March 2026

19. In making its finding on the sole factual allegation in this case, which concerns Mrs Scott's conviction, the Committee considered the evidence placed before it, which includes the certificate of conviction and the PNC disclosure record in relation to Mrs Scott. The Committee took account of the submissions made by Ms Vanstone on behalf of the GDC in relation to the alleged fact.

20. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who advised that a certificate of conviction can be regarded as conclusive evidence of a conviction. The Legal Adviser also referred the Committee to the provisions of Rule 57(5).

21. The Committee bore in mind that the burden of proof at these proceedings rests with the GDC, and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is, whether the alleged matter is proved on the balance of probabilities.

22. The Committee's finding in relation to the fact alleged against Mrs Scott is as follows:

1.	<p><i>On 21 March 2024, you were convicted at Bradford Crown Court of an offence of assault occasioning actual bodily harm on 03 March 2023, contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861.</i></p> <p>Found proved.</p> <p>The Committee had regard to Rule 57(5), which states that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“Where a respondent has been convicted of a criminal offence—</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(a) a copy of the certificate of conviction, certified by a competent officer of a court in the United Kingdom (or, in Scotland, an extract conviction) shall be conclusive proof of the conviction; and</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(b) the findings of fact upon which the conviction is based shall be admissible as proof of those facts.”</i></p> <p>The Committee also noted Rule 57(6), which states that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“The only evidence which may be presented by the respondent in rebuttal of a conviction certified or extracted in accordance with paragraph (5)(a) is evidence for the purpose of proving that the respondent is not the person referred to in the certificate or extract.”</i></p> <p>The Committee had before it a copy of the certificate of conviction relating to Mrs Scott, as well as a copy of her PNC disclosure record, showing her offence, conviction and the respective dates, as included on the police database. There is no evidence to suggest that Mrs Scott is not the person referred to in these documents. The Committee also took into account that no evidence has been provided of any appeal against the conviction by Mrs Scott.</p> <p>In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that the fact of Mrs Scott’s conviction is proved.</p>
----	--

23. The hearing now moves to Stage 2.

Stage 2 of the hearing – 5 March 2026

24. Following the handing down of its finding in relation to the fact of Mrs Scott’s conviction yesterday afternoon, 4 March 2026, the Committee adjourned the hearing to allow a copy of its Stage 1 determination to be sent to her. In doing so, the Committee took into account that Mrs Scott had made it clear that she did not wish to participate in this hearing. However, given that she is not legally represented in this matter, and given the potential consequences for her, should the hearing proceed to the sanction stage, the Committee considered that it was fair and appropriate that she be afforded one last opportunity to engage with these proceedings.

25. After the hearing had been adjourned yesterday, the GDC’s instructing solicitor sent an email to Mrs Scott along with a copy of the Stage 1 determination. In summary, the GDC’s solicitor explained to Mrs Scott that the fact of her conviction had been found proved and therefore the

hearing would be proceeding to the second stage, when the Committee would be considering the issue of current impairment, and if appropriate, sanction. In the email, the GDC's solicitor asked Mrs Scott whether she would like to attend the second stage of the hearing today or alternatively provide written submissions or any other documentation for the Committee's consideration.

26. Mrs Scott responded by email to the GDC's solicitor yesterday afternoon, stating *"No I shall not be attending and hopefully after tomorrow it will all be over and I can actuallu [sic] get on with my life and be taking off the register as I have requested"*.

27. Accordingly, the Committee commenced Stage 2 of the hearing today in the absence of Mrs Scott or any written submissions from her in relation to the matters to be considered at this juncture. However, the Committee did have before it copies of Mrs Scott's previous communications with the GDC regarding what she said were the circumstances of the conduct that led to her conviction.

28. Other evidence before the Committee, in addition to the certificate of conviction and the PNC disclosure report, comprised disclosure documents provided to the GDC by West Yorkshire Police, including a summary of the incident, a copy of the Probation Pre-Sentence Report dated 24 April 2024 and a copy of the Sentencing Remarks from Bradford Crown Court dated 28 August 2024. Also provided to the Committee was a copy of the police body camera footage of Mrs Scott's arrest on 3 March 2023.

29. At this second stage of the hearing, the Committee's considerations were whether Mrs Scott's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction, and if so, what sanction if any to impose on her registration.

30. The Committee heard from Ms Vanstone in relation to the case background. She also made submissions on behalf of the GDC in respect of current impairment and sanction.

Case background and summary of the GDC's submissions

31. Ms Vanstone told the Committee that Mrs Scott referred herself to the GDC on 7 March 2023 by way of a telephone call. Mrs Scott reported to the Council that she had been involved in an altercation with the police, stating that a police officer had struck her, and acting in self defence, she hit him back. Mrs Scott stated that she did not believe that she had been charged at that stage, as the police were investigating the actions of the officer involved.

32. Ms Vanstone drew the Committee's attention to the underlying facts of Mrs Scott's conviction, as set out in the police summary of the incident. It is set out that the police attended Mrs Scott's home address at about 8.35pm on 3 March 2023, following the report of an incident. A scuffle broke out and whilst trying to request back up to restrain Mrs Scott, the police officer concerned was bitten by her on his right arm just above the elbow. Mrs Scott continued to bite the police officer despite him screaming in pain and trying to stop her.

33. Mrs Scott was subsequently interviewed in police custody in the presence of a legal representative. Ms Vanstone stated that a full transcript of the interview was not available but

referred the Committee to the summary provided with the police disclosure information. She highlighted to the Committee that Mrs Scott was shown photographs of the police officer's injuries to which Mrs Scott replied "*Yeah, it's fine, it's not bleeding though is it like he said it was*".

34. Ms Vanstone stated that it was clear from the papers before the Committee that Mrs Scott pleaded not guilty to the offence, but she was convicted by a jury following a trial. Ms Vanstone also referred to the Probation Pre-Sentence Report and asked the Committee to note that during that interview, Mrs Scott continued to dispute the account given by the police officer concerned and maintained that she acted in self defence, despite her conviction. It is noted in the report that Mrs Scott stated that she recognised that she had made the "*wrong choices*" in the situation that she found herself in with the police, but that she denied any deliberate or malicious intent to harm the police officer. Mrs Scott insisted that she had panicked when the police officer had restrained her. It was concluded in the report that it was very unlikely that any amount of forethought or pre-meditation went into the offence and that it was more probable that Mrs Scott reacted instinctively to a threat that she assessed as imminent.

35. Ms Vanstone also invited the Committee to consider the Sentencing Remarks, in which the Judge said:

"...You were drunk, you were aggressive, and you were violent. They were carrying out their duties. You seem to have taken against them. You took against them that night. You continued to take against them, and there is not a shred of remorse demonstrated in the report that I have read. Even the passage of time, with the claim that you no longer drink, has not given you the clarity of thought to recognise that you, and only you, were in the wrong that night.

...

You may choose to hold the Police in low regard. This Court does not... you show not a shred of remorse for the damage that you have done, referring, even to this day, to place blame on him, when a jury of your peers clearly determined no blame attached to him whatsoever".

36. Ms Vanstone highlighted that on 28 August 2024, Mrs Scott was sentenced to 21 months imprisonment, suspended for two years, 30 Rehabilitation Activity Requirement Days and 180 hours of unpaid work.

37. Ms Vanstone stated that Mrs Scott contacted the GDC again after she had been convicted by way of an email dated 4 January 2025, in which she stated, "*I am still adamant that I did what I did in self-defense against the officer*".

38. In her submissions made on behalf of the GDC, Ms Vanstone stated that all violent offences represent a departure from the requisite standards. She stated, however, that the Committee may consider Mrs Scott's conduct to be particularly serious, given the role of the police officer.

39. Ms Vanstone submitted that conviction is a statutory ground of impairment, and the Committee would need to consider whether Mrs Scott's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction. It was Ms Vanstone's submission that there could be no question that it is

impaired. She submitted that Mrs Scott's behaviour was a significant departure from Principle 9 and Standard 9.1 of the GDC's '*Standards for the Dental Team (September 2013)*' ('the GDC Standards'), which state as follows:

Principle 9: Make sure your personal behaviour maintains patients' confidence in you and the dental profession.

Standard 9.1: 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.

40. Ms Vanstone submitted that there is nothing before the Committee in relation to what Mrs Scott says about the conduct that led to her conviction, including any reflection. Ms Vanstone submitted that given the total absence of evidence of insight and Mrs Scott's lack of engagement with this hearing, the Committee could not be reassured that there is no risk of repetition of such behaviour towards people in positions of authority.

41. Ms Vanstone submitted that there are also wider public interest considerations in this case. With reference to relevant case law, she reminded the Committee that even if no public protection issues are identified, it should consider whether public confidence would be undermined in the absence of a finding of impairment. Ms Vanstone stated that convictions are a matter of public record and the public would be looking to the GDC, as the regulator, to see what subsequent action has been taken in respect of Mrs Scott. Ms Vanstone invited the Committee to make a finding of impairment in the circumstances.

42. With regard to sanction, Ms Vanstone submitted that whilst Mrs Scott stated in her email to the GDC dated 4 January 2025 that she wished things could have been different, she has not reflected on her actions. Ms Vanstone stated that Mrs Scott is entitled to maintain her denial, however, the Committee must consider the wider public implications of a registrant having been convicted of such an offence.

43. Ms Vanstone drew the Committee's attention to further comments made by Mrs Scott in her email of 4 January 2025, including that she stated, "*I wish to keep my registration as I have worked hard for it over the last ten years, I have been a leading nurse, trained new trainees, worked closely with management and been a valued member of staff. I am hardworking, trustworthy and reliable and it pains me that people feel bad towards me as this is not the person I am... I wish for the decision makers to consider that I have never been in trouble before this, and I have not had a complaint against me. I continued to work for over 12 months after the incident. I worked with vulnerable patients and children and the incident never affected my nursing skills during this time*".

44. Additionally, in her more recent email to the GDC dated 29 January 2026, Mrs Scott stated that, "*This year in August my suspended sentence will be coming to an end. I have completed my 180 hours of unpaid work, my 30 days of rehabilitation days and I attend all my appointments at probation. I have got on with it and accepted it even though I did not and still do not agree with the outcome but such is life*".

45. It was Ms Vanstone's submission that, given the circumstances of Mrs Scott's offence and the lack of insight demonstrated by her, the only appropriate and proportionate sanction is that of erasure. Ms Vanstone submitted that Mrs Scott's conduct is fundamentally incompatible with

continued registration and that any lesser sanction would be insufficient to uphold the public interest, including public confidence in the dental profession.

The Committee's decisions – 5 March 2026

46. The Committee considered all the evidence before it. It took account of Ms Vanstone's submissions made on behalf of the GDC. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to the applicable legal principles and guidance, and the approach it should take in its decision-making.

47. The Committee reminded itself that its decisions were for its independent judgement. There is no burden or standard of proof at this stage of the proceedings. In exercising its judgement, the Committee had regard to the overarching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety, and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.

Decision on current impairment

48. The Committee considered whether Mrs Scott's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction. It took into account the nature of her offence and the context in which it occurred. Mrs Scott was convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm after her alcohol-induced attack on a police officer during the course of his duties. This was a serious offence which, in the Committee's view, raises significant behavioural and attitudinal concerns. The Committee noted the prolonged nature of Mrs Scott's behaviour towards the police on the day of the incident, as shown on the police body camera footage. The Committee also took into account that she received a 21-month prison sentence for her violent crime, albeit suspended for two years.

49. The Committee considered it clear that Mrs Scott's conduct represented a serious breach of Principle 9 and Standard 9.1 of the GDC Standards, as outlined in the GDC's submissions. The behaviour that led to her conviction was a significant departure from what was expected of her as a registered dental professional.

50. The Committee bore in mind that it must consider Mrs Scott's fitness to practise as of today, and in doing so, it took into account that her offence occurred three years ago. However, the Committee noted that, despite this considerable passage of time, there is a distinct lack of evidence before it in relation to her insight into the conduct or any evidence of reflection, including in relation to the impact on the victim and on the reputation of the dental profession. The Committee noted that as part of her criminal sentence Mrs Scott was subject to 30 Rehabilitation Activity Requirement Days, but she has provided nothing in respect of this or any other remediation she may have undertaken.

51. The Committee also noted the absence of any evidence of empathy or remorse. Furthermore, Mrs Scott has not engaged in any meaningful way with this process. It was the view of the Committee that she has failed to grasp the magnitude of her behaviour and its consequences, including the actual harm she caused to the victim.

52. In all the circumstances, the Committee could not be reassured that the risk of repetition in this case is low. It considered that there remains a possibility that Mrs Scott could act in a way to cause harm to a person in authority if faced with similar circumstances in the future. The Committee therefore concluded that there are ongoing public protection issues arising from this case.

53. The Committee next considered the wider public interest. It was satisfied that wider public interest considerations are engaged, given Mrs Scott's serious criminal conviction. Her behaviour towards the police officer was violent, unacceptable and represented a serious departure from her professional standards. Members of the public would not expect a registered dental professional to behave in such a way. The Committee also considered that Mrs Scott's conduct has been compounded by the lack of evidence of insight, reflection, remediation or remorse. In its view, public confidence would be seriously undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances of this case. The Committee had further regard to the need to uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

54. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Mrs Scott's fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of her conviction.

Decision on sanction

55. The Committee went on to consider what sanction, if any, to impose on Mrs Scott's registration. It took into account that the purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee had regard to the GDC's '*Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (Effective from 6 January 2026)*' ('the Guidance'). It applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with Mrs Scott's interests.

56. In deciding on the appropriate sanction, the Committee considered the issue of aggravating and mitigating factors. It identified the following aggravating features in this case:

- There was actual harm to a member of the public, in this case to a police officer during the course of his duties.
- Lack of insight and the lack of any meaningful engagement with these proceedings.
- Lack of evidence of remorse.

57. The Committee considered that the sole factor in mitigation is Mrs Scott's previous good character, in that there is no evidence of any previous convictions and she has no fitness to practise history before the GDC.

58. Taking all the above factors into account, the Committee considered the available sanctions. It started with the least restrictive as it was required to do. The Committee noted the option to conclude this case without taking any action in relation to Mrs Scott's registration. However, it

considered that such an outcome would be wholly inappropriate, given the identified risk of repetition and the wider public interest concerns.

59. The Committee therefore considered whether it would be appropriate and proportionate to issue Mrs Scott with a reprimand. It had regard to paragraph 263 of the Guidance and decided that none of the factors listed as being relevant to a reprimand apply in the circumstances of this case. Mrs Scott was convicted of a serious offence at the higher level of offending, and the Committee has determined that there is a risk of repetition. There is also a lack of evidence of insight and remorse. The Committee further took into account that Mrs Scott's conduct breached fundamental professional standards. In all the circumstances, the Committee concluded that a reprimand would not be sufficient, appropriate or proportionate.

60. The Committee next considered whether to impose a conditions of practice order on Mrs Scott's registration. In reaching its decision, it took into account that there are no clinical issues in this case. The matters before the Committee relate to behavioural and attitudinal concerns. In its view, there are no workable, measurable or practical conditions that could be imposed to address such concerns. The Committee also considered that conditional registration would not be commensurate to the seriousness of Mrs Scott's conviction and the current impairment found. It considered that such a sanction would not serve to uphold the public interest, in particular public confidence in the dental profession.

61. The Committee went on to consider whether to suspend Mrs Scott's registration for a specified period up to a maximum 12 months. It had regard to paragraph 277 of the Guidance, which states that:

“Suspension may be appropriate when all, or some, of the following factors are present:

- a. There is evidence of repetition of the behaviour.*
- b. The registrant has not shown insight into the issues which led to a finding of current impairment being made, and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour.*
- c. A lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest.*
- d. There is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems (which might make erasure the appropriate order)”.*

62. The Committee noted that some of the factors from paragraph 277 of the Guidance apply in this case, particularly the lack of insight, the risk of repetition and that a lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest. However, in its view, the lack of evidence of insight, reflection and remorse from Mrs Scott over the past three years, raises a significant concern about her attitude. There appears to have been no consideration on her part of the impact of her behaviour on the victim or how members of the public may perceive the wider dental profession as a result of her actions.

63. The Committee noted that harmful deep-seated or professional attitudinal problems might make erasure the appropriate order. Therefore, it had regard to paragraph 282 of the Guidance, which deals with erasure. The Committee considered that a number of factors indicating erasure are present in this case. In particular, it noted:

- The findings include serious departure(s) from the relevant professional standards.
- There was serious harm caused to an individual.
- A continuing risk of serious harm to other persons has been identified.
- Mrs Scott has demonstrated a persistent lack of insight into the seriousness of her actions or their consequences.
- A lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest.

64. Given the presence of these factors from paragraph 282 of the Guidance, and its serious concerns about Mrs Scott's personal and professional attitude, the Committee concluded that the suspension of her registration, even for the maximum period of 12 months, would not be sufficient to uphold the wider public interest.

65. In the Committee's judgement, the gravity of Mrs Scott's offending behaviour and her failure to engage meaningfully with this process, such that there is a lack of evidence of insight, reflection, remediation or remorse, represents conduct that is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration.

66. In all the circumstances, the Committee determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is one of erasure. In imposing this highest sanction, the Committee was satisfied that the need to protect the public interest outweighed Mrs Scott's own interests.

67. Unless Mrs Scott exercises her right of appeal, her name will be erased from the Register for Dental Care Professionals, 28 days from the date that notice of this Committee's determination is deemed to have been served upon her.

68. The Committee now invites submissions from Ms Vanstone, as to whether an immediate order of suspension should be imposed on Mrs Scott's registration to cover the appeal period, pending the taking effect of its substantive direction for erasure.

Decision on an immediate order – 6 March 2026

69. In considering whether to impose an immediate order of suspension on Mrs Scott's registration, the Committee took account of Ms Vanstone's application that such an order should be imposed for the protection of the public and in the wider public interest. It was her submission that, given the Committee's determination to erase Mrs Scott's name from the Register, it would be inconsistent to allow her the opportunity to return to unrestricted practice during the appeal period and before the substantive sanction for erasure takes effect.

70. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who confirmed the statutory test for immediate orders and drew its attention to paragraph 288 of the Guidance, which sets out relevant information.

71. In all the circumstances, having considered its substantive decisions, the Committee determined that the imposition of an immediate order of suspension on Mrs Scott's registration is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest.

72. The Committee has identified a risk of repetition, given the lack of evidence of insight, reflection, remorse and remediation from Mrs Scott in relation to her serious behaviour towards a member of the public. The Committee had regard to paragraph 288 of the Guidance and noted that an immediate order might be considered appropriate where the registrant's behaviour is considered to pose a risk. In view of the identified risk in this case, the Committee was satisfied an immediate order is necessary on public protection grounds.

73. The Committee was also satisfied that an immediate order is required in the wider public interest, in view of the gravity of its findings. Mrs Scott's behaviour significantly impacted her professional boundaries and seriously undermined the reputation of the dental profession. Furthermore, she has failed to engage in any meaningful way with these proceedings. In its substantive determination, the Committee concluded that Mrs Scott's conduct, as highlighted in this case, is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration as a dental professional. The Committee considered that it would be inconsistent not to impose an immediate order in the circumstances. It took into account that in the absence of an immediate order, Mrs Scott could, if she wished to do so, return to unrestricted practice during the appeal period, or for longer, in the event of an appeal. The Committee considered that immediate action is required to maintain public confidence in the dental professions and the regulatory process.

74. The effect of the foregoing substantive determination and this order is that Mrs Scott's registration will be suspended to cover the appeal period. Unless she exercises her right of appeal, the substantive direction for erasure will take effect 28 days from the date of deemed service.

75. Should Mrs Scott exercise her right of appeal, this immediate order will remain in place until the resolution of the appeal.

76. The interim order currently in place on Mrs Scott's registration is hereby revoked.

77. That concludes this determination.