



**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing**

30 – 31 October 2025

Name: HUSSAIN, Sajaad
Registration number: 192601
Case number: CAS-210160-Y1Z1K5

General Dental Council: Tomas McGarvey, Counsel
Instructed by IHLPS
Registrant: Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of conviction
Outcome: Suspension (with a review)
Duration: 12 months
Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Tanya Viehoff (Chair, Dental Care Professional member)
Kerry McKevitt (Lay member)
Samaneh Nezamivand-Chegini (Dentist member)
Legal adviser: Jane Kilgannon
Committee Secretary: Sara Page

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.
2. You were present at the hearing and not represented.
3. Mr Tomas McGarvey, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

Stage 1

Preliminary matters

Rule 18 application regarding amendment to the charge

4. At the outset of the hearing, the Committee heard an application made by Mr McGarvey on behalf of the GDC to amend a typographical error in the final line of the charge.
5. Mr McGarvey referred the Committee to the word '*fats*', which he stated was an incorrect spelling of '*facts*'. He informed the Committee that this amendment was not opposed by you.
6. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who made particular reference to the relevant Rule to be considered.
7. The Committee was satisfied that, having regard to the merits of the case and the fairness of the proceedings, correcting the typographical error highlighted could be made without injustice. The Committee therefore acceded to Mr McGarvey's application and allowed the amendments as proposed and agreed by both parties.

Rule 57 application regarding admissibility of evidence

8. In the absence of legal representation on your behalf, Mr McGarvey addressed the Committee on an application regarding a number of redactions proposed by you in the evidential bundle, further to the redactions already agreed by the GDC.
9. Mr McGarvey informed the Committee that two bundles had been provided: Bundle 1 with pages 21 – 25 completely redacted; and Bundle 2 with various minor redactions across pages 21 – 25. He confirmed that the minor redactions included the anonymisation of the victim's name.
10. In reference to Bundle 2, Mr McGarvey submitted that the agreed minor amendments would ensure a fair hearing for you as these had been carefully considered by both the GDC and by Mr McGarvey himself. He submitted that what is left is plainly admissible in light of the seriousness of this case and that it was important to see the contemporaneous witness statement of the victim in this case, a serving police constable (PC), and his summary of what happened at the incident in addition to the 'bodycam' footage.
11. On your behalf, Mr McGarvey took the Committee through the redactions you have proposed which included:
 - 1) references to your hand gestures, hurried manner and continued remonstrations;
 - 2) you denying having photographic identification on your person;
 - 3) the PC removing your car keys to prevent you driving away from the scene; and
 - 4) information relating to the custody suite.

12. Mr McGarvey told the Committee that you have proposed these redactions as you believe that the information is inaccurate and therefore it is prejudicial to you.
13. In light of the further proposed redactions, Mr McGarvey invited the Committee to reconsider the 'bodycam' footage in this case. He stated that whilst much of the footage can be clearly heard, there are some areas of the footage which cannot be heard, making the unredacted statement relevant and providing information not necessarily ascertained from the footage. He submitted that whilst the information you proposed to redact from the statements in the bundle may be prejudicial, it is factually accurate and is corroborated by the 'bodycam' footage. Mr McGarvey submitted that for the Committee to be able to attach the appropriate weight to the evidence, it would be appropriate for it to have the most contemporaneous account of the PC along with the footage from the incident itself.
14. In relation to your request to redact the information referring to the custody suite, Mr McGarvey submitted that this information was relevant as it was not included in the 'bodycam' footage. He submitted that any concerns regarding fairness can be addressed by the Committee attaching appropriate weight to that evidence.
15. In this regard, Mr McGarvey invited the Committee to reject the application and to remove the fully redacted bundle (Bundle 1) from evidence. He invited the Committee to admit Bundle 2, without the further proposed redactions, into evidence as 'Exhibit 1'.
16. You told the Committee that, as a matter of principle, you are concerned with the truth. You stated that the 'bodycam' footage shows everything and that the witness statement and incident summary try to paint you to be someone who was deliberately obstructive. You told the Committee that the statements are not true accounts of the incident and that this is the reason for your application to make the proposed redactions.
17. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser who referred the Committee to the relevant Rule and the powers and principles to be applied.
18. Having considered the 'bodycam' footage, the Committee was unable to hear some of the start of the interaction between you and the PC, as the audio is distorted by environmental factors and background noise. In addition, some of the discussion between you and the PC is taking place through a partially opened car window. In this regard, the Committee found the statement and the incident summary to be relevant and helpful in understanding the interaction between you and the PC before the comment that led to your conviction.
19. In relation to the proposal to redact references to you denying you had photographic identification, as detailed in redaction proposal 2), the Committee noted that it was clear from the footage that you are asked by the PC if you have identification on you and there is a protracted discussion about it as a result of you stating that you did not.
20. In relation to the PC removing your car keys to prevent you driving away, as detailed in redaction proposal 3), the Committee was satisfied that this interaction could clearly be seen and heard on the footage provided.
21. In relation to the information relating to the custody suite, as detailed in redaction proposal 4), the Committee noted that this is not directly related to the allegations you face today. The Committee determined that this was not relevant to its deliberations today and therefore it was fair and in the interests of justice to exclude this evidence.



22. Whilst the Committee accepted that the behaviour in proposals 1) – 3) may be prejudicial, the conduct referred to in the statement and incident summary can clearly be seen and heard on the footage and therefore the Committee was not persuaded that the references were inaccurate. Accordingly, the Committee determined that the redactions sought were unreasonable and disproportionate and therefore it was fair and in the interests of justice to admit this evidence and rejected your application in this regard.
23. The Committee accepted your application in relation to redaction proposal 4) as information relating to the custody suite was not the subject of the charge being considered by the Committee at this hearing. Accordingly, the Committee acceded to your application and excluded this evidence. With the agreement of the parties, the Committee determined to put the matter out of its mind rather than requesting a further redacted copy of the documentation provided.

Charge

24. The charge being considered by the Committee, as detailed in the Notice of Hearing, dated 11 September 2025, as amended, are as follows:

‘That being registered as a dentist:

1. *On 10 May 2024, you were convicted at Bradford Magistrates Court of Racially / religiously aggravated intentional harassment / alarm / distress – words / writing, committed on 13 November 2023, contrary to s.28 and s.31(1)(b) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.*

AND that by reason of the facts alleged, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of conviction.’

Committee’s decision and reasons on findings of fact

25. You informed the Committee that you admitted the charge in full.
26. Having had regard to the certificate of conviction, dated 28 March 2025, the Committee accepted this document as conclusive proof of your conviction in accordance with Rule 57(5) of ‘*The General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*’ (‘the Rules’).
27. Accordingly, the Committee accepted your admission and found **Charge 1 proved**.

Stage 2

28. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee then moved on to consider whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired and, if so, what sanction would be appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances.

Background and summary of the GDC's case

29. On 13 November 2023, a PC was on duty and at 17:54 had reason to stop your vehicle for a document check as the Police National Computer (PNC) indicated the vehicle was not insured.
30. The PC approached the driver's side door and spoke to you through a small gap in the window. It was shown on the PC's 'bodycam' footage that you were waving your hands and indicating to the PC that he ought to hurry up. Whilst not entirely audible from the footage, it appeared that you were using the words "*next question*" and "*motor trade*", indicating that you did not have domestic insurance for the vehicle and the PC took the view that you were behaving in an obstructive and difficult manner.
31. The footage shows a discussion regarding your 'trade plates' and identification continued for a period of time, and you appeared to refer to previous incidents with the police regarding your vehicle and insurance. The PC indicated that he was required to ensure that you were legitimately and legally able to drive the vehicle and that it could be on the road. At this point, the PC attempted to reach through small gap in window to remove your car keys as, due to your behaviour, he was concerned that you may have attempted to drive off. This action resulted in the PC opening the car door and standing in the area between the door and wheel arch with the intention of stopping you from driving away.
32. The footage showed you remonstrating for a period of time but eventually you produced a photographic identification card from your pocket, despite having previously said that you did not have identification with you. You replaced the keys in the ignition. The PC then removed the keys from the vehicle.
33. An audible comment could be heard on the 'bodycam' footage, and you stated, "*...Give me my keys back you racist white bastard.*" The PC asked you to confirm what you had said, and you said, "*You are racist, why have you taken away my keys? I'm really not happy.*"
34. You were then arrested for the racially aggravated public order offence and at that point you said you were sorry. You were taken to Halifax detention suite, were interviewed and subsequently released. The matter was reviewed in line with relevant guidelines and was referred to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) to make decision on disposal. After consulting with the PC, the victim in this case, a decision to charge you was made and sent to you by postal decision.
35. You appeared before Bradford Magistrates' Court where you entered a guilty plea. As a result, you were fined £448, ordered to pay CPS costs of £179 and a statutory surcharge of £85.

Evidence

36. The Committee had regard to documentary and video evidence in the GDC's bundles, which included the following:
- 'Bodycam' footage, dated 13 November 2023;
 - Certified Memorandum of Conviction, dated 28 March 2025;
 - Police incident summary;
 - Witness statement of PC, dated 13 November 2023;
 - Rule 4 observations provided by you;

- Reflective statement, dated 22 October 2025;
- Continuing Professional Development certificates;
- Testimonials; and
- [PRIVATE].

Submissions

37. In accordance with Rule 20, the Committee heard submissions from Mr McGarvey, on behalf of the GDC and from you, in relation to the matters of impairment and sanction. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to impairment and sanction.
38. Mr McGarvey, on behalf of the GDC, submitted that the public should not have racist dentists on the register. He submitted that the offence in this case is serious and that ordinary members of the public would view it as such and would be disgusted by what was said by you to a serving police constable.
39. In relation to impairment, Mr McGarvey invited the Committee to conclude that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction. He referred it to relevant case law which may assist the Committee in coming to its decision on impairment including *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin) and *Council for Healthcare Regulatory Excellence v Nursing and Midwifery Council and Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 (Admin).
40. Mr McGarvey submitted that there is no criticism of your clinical skill or competence but that your conduct is contrary to the written standards and fundamental tenets of the dental profession. He submitted that you have shown some insight into your behaviour, as evidenced in your defence bundle. However, he invited the Committee to find there are areas of your Rule 4 observations and reflective statement where there have been attempts to justify or minimise your behaviour. In order to rebuild and uphold public confidence in the profession, Mr McGarvey submitted that a finding of current impairment should be made in this case.
41. In relation to sanction, Mr McGarvey referred the Committee to the GDC's document '*Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance 2016 (ISG)*' (revised December 2020). He submitted that the public would be insufficiently protected by any sanction lesser than an order of suspension for the maximum period of 12 months. He stated conditional registration would be impractical and unworkable in the circumstances and that it might also be said that this is a case that would require erasure. Mr McGarvey told the Committee that the matter of erasure has been carefully considered alongside the reflection and material provided by you and balanced with the cooperation and engagement you have demonstrated. Whilst erasure is not sought by the GDC at this time, he submitted that this case is serious and a maximum period of suspension with a review, and that an immediate suspension order ought to be imposed to cover the appeal period.
42. You told the Committee that many things about the incident, as relied on by the GDC, were addressed by you in court where "*the same narrative was being pushed*". You stated that you did not consider that you were obstructive and were adamant that you answered the questions that were asked of you at the scene. You told the Committee that you believed that you fulfilled your obligation as a motorist by stopping your vehicle when requested and answering the PC's questions. You alluded to a previous incident with the police and said that you explained this to the PC at the time, but he had not listened. You said that you did not believe you had your driving licence on you, and this was the reason you did not initially provide it.
43. You stated that the PC, without authority or warning, opened your car door. You said that you did not complain or mention this at the time despite you considering the PC's actions to be "*heavy-handed*". You stated that you had no intention of driving away from the scene and the PC's actions were unnecessary.

44. Having retrieved your driving licence from your pocket, you stated that you held it at a distance from the PC but when you were told to hand it to him, you did so, thereby complying with section 163 and 164 of the Road Traffic Act 1988. You told the Committee that you admitted the offence in court, but a narrative was pushed that was not true from your perspective. You stated that you have never tried to justify your actions, have accepted what you did, and not sought to minimise your actions.
45. In relation to your Rule 4 observations, you stated that these were provided ten months after the incident and were based entirely on memory as you had not viewed the 'bodycam' footage. You recalled the incident as being "fast-paced" and accepted that your recollection may not have been accurate. You referred to the incident as "a single comment" and whilst you were in no way attempting to minimise it or blame anybody, despite being called an 'arse' by the PC during the incident, you had acted impulsively and in anger in response to having your key removed from your vehicle. You stated that your comment was completely unacceptable and was not a deliberate attempt to target someone.
46. [PRIVATE]. You recalled being told by the PC that you should be ashamed of yourself and that you accept people should not be spoken to in such a manner, either inside or outside the workplace.
47. You assured the Committee that it is behaviour that you would never want to exhibit again, that you have taken all necessary steps to rectify and that this has been a difficult situation for you. You referred the Committee to the references you have provided, which you stated would testify that you have been a decent member of the profession for many years and have continued to be so after the incident, and that you hope to carry on being a decent member of the profession in the future.
48. You stated that you would accept that you are currently impaired but would like to be able to continue working as a dentist.

Committee's decision and reasons

49. In coming to its decisions, the Committee considered all the evidence presented to it, including the defence documents provided by you for the purposes of this hearing.
50. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser who referred to relevant case law which may assist the Committee and to the powers and principles to be observed.

Impairment

51. In coming to its decision on impairment, the Committee had regard to the over-arching objective of the GDC, which is to protect, promote and maintain the health, safety, and well-being of the public; to promote and maintain public confidence in the dental profession; and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.
52. The Committee took into account your defence bundle, paying particular attention to any demonstration of insight, remediation, remorse, and evidence of mitigation of future risk.
53. In its consideration of public protection, the Committee referred to the judgment in *CHRE v NMC and Grant* and was satisfied that your racially aggravated conduct caused the victim actual harm, brought the dental profession into disrepute and breach fundamental tenets of the profession. The Committee determined that you had breached the following standards of the GDC document, 'Standards for the Dental Team':

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

9.1.1

You must treat all team members, other colleagues and members of the public fairly, with dignity and in line with the law.

54. As a result, the Committee was satisfied that your fitness to practise was impaired at the time of the incident.
55. In its assessment of whether your fitness to practise continues to be impaired on the ground of public protection, the Committee considered whether your conduct was likely to be repeated in the future and was assisted by the 'test' outlined by Silber J in *Cohen v GMC*:
- 'It must be highly relevant in determining if a [registrant's] fitness to practise is impaired that first, his or her conduct which led to the charge is easily remediable, second that it has been remedied and third that it is highly unlikely to be repeated.'*
56. In its consideration of insight, you told the Committee that you were sorry for what had happened and regret the impact that it has had on you. You told the Committee on numerous occasions that you have not sought to minimise or excuse your behaviour, but the Committee noted that your submissions were more focused on justifying your behaviour than on demonstrating that you understood why your behaviour was unacceptable. Therefore, the Committee found it unlikely that your expressions of remorse were genuine. Your submissions focused on where you believed you have behaved appropriately, namely by stopping your vehicle, providing the identification and that you had fulfilled your obligations as a motorist. You denied being obstructive or difficult in your interactions with the PC and sought to remove the mention of your remonstrations from the documentation. However, it was clear from the 'bodycam' footage that you had been agitated in your interactions, and you do not appear to have yet accepted this. You have also not sufficiently addressed in your submissions or reflection how your conduct would have made the victim feel or demonstrated adequate insight into how a serving police officer being racially abused whilst in the line of duty by a dentist would impact on the public's perception of the dental profession.
57. In its consideration of remediation, the Committee carefully considered the defence bundle you have provided, and the submissions made by you at this hearing. The Committee noted that you have undertaken five CPD courses dated between 24 and 30 September 2025 in areas including anger management, hate crime and personal conduct. The Committee took into account that these courses, undertaken only a few weeks before this hearing and almost two years after the incident were appropriate attempts to address the issues but were not sufficient to demonstrate that the risk of repetition has been mitigated. Likewise, the Committee commended you for undertaking additional remediative steps, [PRIVATE] two weeks before this hearing was scheduled to commence. Despite having undertaken these courses [PRIVATE], the Committee remained concerned that you have not yet fully remediated your conduct as the steps taken by you were commenced only recently.
58. The Committee did take into account the positive references you have provided but were unable to attribute much weight to them as they were not formal documents provided on letter-headed paper, were undated and one of the authors only provided their first name.
59. In light of all the information before it, the Committee determined that both your remediation and insight are incomplete and as a result, there is a real risk of repetition in the future.
60. Therefore, the Committee was satisfied that there remains a risk to the public and that a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.

61. The Committee bore in mind the overarching objective to maintain public confidence in the profession and upholding standards. It concluded that public confidence would be seriously undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case and therefore also finds your practice impaired on the ground of public interest.

Committee's decision and reasons on sanction

62. 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.
63. The Committee also took into account the following mitigating features:
- no evidence of further incidents;
 - an apology was given;
 - evidence of previous good character;
 - the fact that the incident was a single, isolated event; and
 - time elapsed since the incident.
64. The Committee took into account the following aggravating features:
- actual harm to the victim; and
 - very limited insight.
65. The Committee had regard to its previous finding of impairment in coming to its decision and considered each sanction in ascending order of severity.
66. 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 was satisfied there is a risk of repetition that would demonstrate a risk of harm to the public and you have not demonstrated genuine remorse or sufficient insight that would mitigate against any ongoing risk. 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.
67. The Committee next considered whether placing conditions on your registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The Committee was of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated given the nature of the offending behaviour. There are no clinical concerns in this case and there are no conditions that would suitably address the issues in this case.
68. 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:
- the registrant has not shown insight and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour;
 - patients' interests would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction; and
 - public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction.

69. The Committee considered this case to be extremely serious and that a criminal conviction for a racially aggravated offence towards a member of police enforcement was considered at the top end of the spectrum of seriousness. Whilst it did consider erasure, the Committee concluded that your conduct is remediable and that it was disproportionate to erase you from the Register in light of the information before it and that your conduct was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the Register.
70. Balancing all these factors, the Committee directs your registration be suspended for a period of 12 months to reflect the severity of the racially aggravated comment and the subsequent conviction. The Committee determined that this is necessary in order to protect patients and to maintain and uphold public confidence in the profession, whilst sending the public, the profession, and you, a clear message about the standards of practice required of a dentist.
71. The Committee noted the hardship the suspension may cause you, however this is outweighed by the public interest in this regard.
72. The Committee directs that this order be reviewed before its expiry, and you will be informed of the date and time in writing. The reviewing PCC will consider what action it should take in relation to your registration following an assessment of the concerns affecting your fitness to practise.
73. The reviewing PCC may be assisted to receive:
- An updated reflective statement;
 - Evidence of further relevant CPD and relevant training; and
 - Evidence that your skills and knowledge have been maintained during the suspension.



Stage 3

74. The substantive suspension 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.
75. The Committee noted Mr McGarvey's submissions that an immediate suspension is required and that you did not make any specific submissions in this regard.
76. 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.
77. The immediate suspension will remain in place until any appeal is disposed of or, if no appeal is lodged, the substantive suspension will replace the immediate order 28 days after you are sent the decision of the Committee in writing.
78. This decision will be confirmed to you in writing in accordance with the Act.
79. That concludes this determination.