

HEARING HELD IN PUBLIC

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

7 and 8 April 2026

Name: COLWILL, Sophie Alice

Registration number: 298490

Case number: CAS-208399

General Dental Council: Olivia Rawlings, counsel
Instructed by Carly Smith, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Not represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of conviction and misconduct

Outcome: Suspended with immediate suspension (with a review)

Duration: 12 months

Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Matthew King (Dentist) (Chair)
Jayne Hilderley (Lay)
Gemma Forsythe (Dental Care Professional)

Legal Adviser: Michael Bell

Committee Secretary: Gareth Llewellyn

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

Findings of fact – 8 April 2026

Name: COLWILL, Sophie Alice
Registration number: 298490

Miss Colwill

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being held remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice.
2. You are present and are not represented. Olivia Rawlings of counsel, instructed by Carly Smith of the General Dental Council's (GDC's) In-House Legal Presentation Service (IHLPS), appears for the GDC.

The charge

3. The charge that you face at this hearing reads as follows:

"That being registered as a dental nurse:

1. *On 30 May 2024, you were convicted at Exeter Magistrates' Court of an offence of Stalking, in that between 1 May 2024 and 30 May 2024 you pursued a course of conduct which amounted to stalking causing serious alarm and distress, which had a substantial adverse effect on the day-to-day activities when you knew or ought to have known that your course of conduct would cause alarm or distress, contrary to section 4A(1)(a)(b)(ii) and (5) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.*
2. *You failed to inform the General Dental Council, immediately, that on 30 May 2024 you were convicted of the criminal offence set out at 1. above.*
3. *Your conduct set out at 2 above, was:*
 - a) *misleading; and / or*
 - b) *dishonest*

And that by reason of the above your fitness to practise is impaired by conviction and / or misconduct."

Background to the case and summary of allegations

4. The allegations giving rise to this hearing arise out of your criminal conviction for an offence of stalking.
5. It is alleged that on 30 May 2024 you appeared before Exeter Magistrates' Court and, having pleaded guilty, you were convicted of an offence of stalking. You reappeared before the Court on 6 September 2024 and were sentenced to a period of imprisonment of 20 weeks' duration, suspended for 12 months. You were also ordered to comply with a restraining order for a

period of five years. You were further ordered to pay a victim surcharge and to undertake rehabilitation activities.

IN PRIVATE

6. [text omitted].

IN PUBLIC

7. In the intervening period, more particularly on 28 August 2024, you self-referred your conviction to the GDC. It is alleged that you failed to notify the GDC of your conviction immediately, and that such alleged conduct was misleading and dishonest.

Evidence

8. The Committee has been provided with documentary material in relation to the heads of charge that you face, including the witness statement and documentary exhibits of a GDC caseworker with knowledge of the case, namely Elizabeth Morbin, and testimonial letters submitted by you from two colleagues and a friend.

9. The Committee heard oral evidence from Ms Morbin.

Committee’s findings of fact

10. The Committee has taken into account all the evidence presented to it, both written and oral. It has considered the submissions made by Ms Rawlings on behalf of the GDC and those made by you. The Committee has had regard to the GDC’s *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026).

11. The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee is mindful that the burden of proof lies with the GDC, and has considered the heads of charge against the civil standard of proof, that is to say, the balance of probabilities. The Committee has considered each head and sub-head of charge separately, although some of its findings will be announced together.

12. I will now announce the Committee’s findings in relation to each head of charge:

1.	<p><i>On 30 May 2024, you were convicted at Exeter Magistrates’ Court of an offence of Stalking, in that between 1 May 2024 and 30 May 2024 you pursued a course of conduct which amounted to stalking causing serious alarm and distress, which had a substantial adverse effect on the day-to-day activities when you knew or ought to have known that your course of conduct would cause alarm or distress, contrary to section 4A(1)(a)(b)(ii) and (5) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee had regard to Rule 57 (5) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (‘the Rules’). The Committee determined that the certified copy of the Certificate of Conviction placed before it provides conclusive proof of both the fact of conviction, and also proves the facts of the offence giving rise to the conviction. The Committee notes that the facts upon which the conviction was based have been found proven beyond reasonable doubt, which is an evidential standard that is higher than that employed by this Committee. The Committee accepted that it cannot go behind the facts on which the convictions was made.</p>

	Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 1 proved.
2.	<p><i>You failed to inform the General Dental Council, immediately, that on 30 May 2024 you were convicted of the criminal offence set out at 1. above.</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>In approaching this charge the Committee was mindful of Standard 9.3.1 of the GDC's <i>Standards for the Dental Team</i> (September 2023), which states:</p> <p><i>'You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world. See our guidance on reporting criminal proceedings for more information.'</i></p> <p>The Committee has heard that you self-referred your conviction to the GDC on 28 August 2024, which is nearly three months after you had been convicted. The Committee considers that you were under a duty to <i>immediately</i> inform the GDC of your conviction. The Committee finds that the evidence presented to it demonstrates that you failed to do so, as you did not notify the GDC of your conviction of 30 May 2024 until 28 August 2024. The Committee specifically considers that notifying the GDC nearly three months later does not constitute an immediate notification, and in fact represents a delay.</p> <p>Therefore, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 2 proved.</p>
3.	<i>Your conduct set out at 2 above, was:</i>
3. (a)	<p><i>misleading; and / or</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>The Committee finds that your failure to immediately inform the GDC of your conviction was misleading, as it meant that the GDC was entitled to believe that you had not been convicted of the offence in question, when in fact you had been so convicted. In the Committee's judgement your conduct deprived the GDC of a proper understanding of issues relevant to your fitness to practise.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Committee finds the facts alleged at head of charge 3 (a) proved.</p>
3. (b)	<p><i>dishonest</i></p> <p>Proved</p>
	<p>In approaching this head of charge the Committee applied the test set out in <i>Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd. t/a Crockfords</i> [2017] UKSC 67. The test is that the Committee must decide subjectively the actual state of an individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts, and must then apply the objective standards of ordinary and decent people to determine whether the individual's conduct is dishonest by those standards. The reasonableness or otherwise of an individual's belief is a matter of evidence, and is often in practice determinative, going to whether an individual held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that their belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once the individual's actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether their conduct was honest or dishonest is to be</p>



determined by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the individual must appreciate that what they have done is, by those standards, dishonest.

The Committee therefore first sought to determine your actual stage of knowledge and belief by reference to the evidence with which it has been provided.

The Committee took account of your self-referral to the GDC on 28 August 2024. In that self-referral webform communication you stated, *'On Friday September 6th I will be sentenced with stalking which involves another party within the dental industry. If you require any other information please don't hesitate to inform me. My employer is aware of the situation and I was unaware of whom to inform.'* In response to the GDC's acknowledgement of your self-referral, and its request for additional information, you provided documentation arising from your court appearance and offered to provide any further information that the GDC might require.

The Committee has been provided with a written record of a telephone conversation that you had with the GDC on 20 September 2024. It is recorded that, during that conversation, you stated that your solicitor was asked to send a copy of the charge sheet relating to your court appearance, and that you were not familiar with the term 'charge', and were unsure of some of the details of the criminal proceedings.

On 30 April 2025 you emailed the GDC to make a response to the allegations that were being brought against you. In your email you stated as follows:

'I sincerely apologise my delay in notifying the GDC of the plead of guilty on the 30th May 2024.'

IN PRIVATE

[text omitted].

IN PUBLIC

I accept in hindsight I should have notified the GDC straight away. I can only apologise as I have thankfully never been in a situation like this before and it related to a personal issue not a professional one. This was, however, an error on my part.

Once I had a date for sentencing, I advised the GDC and provided all the relevant details. I have adhered to all the terms of my bail and my probation and I am committed to ensuring this never happens again.

I have always made sure that this awful event has never affected my work or the care of the patients I nurse for. I fully understand the terms on which I am expected to adhere to under the GDC going forward.'

IN PRIVATE

[text omitted].

IN PUBLIC

In light of this evidence, the Committee has determined that the actual state of your knowledge or belief as to the facts was that you knew that you were required to inform the GDC immediately of your conviction. The Committee considers that it is inherently implausible that you did not know that you were under such a duty. In reaching this conclusion the Committee took particular note of the content of your self-referral email of 28 August 2024 in which you referred to your forthcoming sentencing as summarised above. The fact of this email, consisting as it does of you notifying the GDC of your impending sentencing, connotes your understanding of needing to inform the GDC of such criminal proceedings. The Committee also considers that the serious nature of the offence of which you had been convicted, and for which you were awaiting sentencing, means that it is more likely than not that the matter was at the forefront of your mind, including in relation to your duty to notify the GDC.

Your self-referral email of 28 August 2024 refers to you being unsure of who should be notified of your conviction, but this does not adequately explain why you then found yourself able of informing the GDC. The Committee infers that you were aware of your duty, and sought to conceal the fact of your conviction from the GDC until such time as your impending sentencing meant that you could not conceal its fact any longer. The Committee also found that the differing accounts that you have provided of your awareness of informing the GDC further undermined your credibility. The Committee also accepted the GDC's submission that the documentation placed before it suggests that on 15 July 2024 you were informed of a sentencing date of 6 September 2024. Given that you self-referred your conviction to the GDC around six weeks later on 28 August 2024, this documentary evidence contradicts your account of you informing the GDC of your conviction as soon as you were notified of the sentencing date.

Having determined your actual knowledge and belief as to the facts, the Committee moved on to apply the objective standards of ordinary and decent people to determine whether your conduct is dishonest by those standards. The Committee considers that an ordinary and decent person would view your conduct as an attempt to deliberately mislead the GDC and frustrate its proper regulatory functions by denying it of knowledge of matters relevant to a consideration of your fitness to practise.

The Committee therefore finds the facts alleged at head of charge 3 (b) proved.

13. We move to stage two.

Determination on misconduct, impairment and sanction – 8 April 2026

14. Following the handing down of the Committee's findings of fact on 8 April 2026, the hearing proceeded to stage two; that is to say, misconduct, impairment and sanction.

Proceedings at stage two

15. The Committee has considered all the evidence presented to it, both oral and written. It has taken into account the submissions made by Ms Rawlings on behalf of the GDC and those made by you. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

Evidence at stage two

16. Save for your written submissions and written reflective statement summarised below, the Committee received no further oral or written evidence at this second stage of the hearing.

Summary of submissions

17. You submitted that you understand the seriousness of these proceedings. You set out the steps that you have taken since your conviction, the lessons that you have learned, and that you pose no risk to the public. You stated that you have already been punished by the criminal justice system and have complied fully with the terms of your sentence. You submitted that you have shown '*accountability, respect for the law and a genuine commitment to change*'. You stated that such compliance is an important part of your remediation. You stated that you enjoy the support of your dental employers at the practice at which you work, and that this support was also present during the criminal proceedings. You submitted that your employers have no concerns about patient safety and that they would welcome you back at the practice. You submitted that their confidence in you is a clear indication that you do not pose a risk to the public. You submitted that you are remorseful for, and recognise the seriousness of, your conduct, including on the public and the profession, and that you have identified what you must do to avoid a repeat. You stated that your insight is evident in your engagement with the criminal justice system, with the probation service and in these proceedings. You stated that you fully understand your professional responsibilities. You stated that you have not reoffended and have shown '*stability and responsibility*' in your practice. You stated that public protection issues are not engaged in this case, and that you are not a risk to the public. You submitted that the underlying matters have already been dealt with, and that there is no public interest in imposing a sanction.
18. You read out a reflection statement in which you described the impact that your conduct had on the victim, the profession and the public. You described your criminal sentence as '*a turning point*', allowing you to manage your behaviours more appropriately. You stated that as a dental care professional you recognise that your conduct outside of work is important, and that you recognise the need to be open and honest in your dealings with your regulator. You stated that you are determined to continue to change.
19. Ms Rawlings invited the Committee to determine that the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 2, 3 (a) and 3 (b) amount to misconduct. Ms Rawlings submitted that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of that misconduct, as well as by reason of the conviction set out at head of charge 1, with regard to both public protection and public interest considerations. Ms Rawlings invited the Committee to consider imposing a sanction of suspension for a period of between nine and 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period.

Fitness to practise history

20. Ms Rawlings addressed the Committee in accordance with Rule 20 (1) (a) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). Ms Rawlings stated that you have no fitness to practise history with the GDC.

Misconduct

21. The Committee first considered whether the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 2, 3 (a) and 3 (b) constitute misconduct. In considering this and all other matters, the Committee has exercised its own independent judgement.
22. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the following paragraphs of the GDC's *Standards for the Dental Team* (September 2013) in place at the time of the incidents giving

rise to the facts that the Committee has found proved at heads of charge 2, 3 (a) and 3 (b). These paragraphs state that as a dental care professional you must:

1.3 Be honest and act with integrity.

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.

9.3 Inform the GDC if you are subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against you anywhere in the world.

9.3.1 Inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world. See our guidance on reporting criminal proceedings for more information.

23. The Committee's findings at heads of charge 2, 3 (a) and 3 (b) arise out of your criminal conviction for an offence of stalking. The Committee has found that you failed to inform the GDC immediately of the fact of your conviction, and that your failure to do so represents conduct that was misleading and dishonest.
24. In light of the findings of fact that it has made, the Committee has determined that the proven facts amount to misconduct. The Committee considers that your conduct was a serious departure from the standards reasonably to be expected of a registered dental care professional and that your acts and omissions would be viewed as deplorable by your fellow practitioners. In the Committee's judgement you breached a fundamental tenet of the profession, namely the need to act honestly. The Committee has found that you sought to conceal the fact of your conviction from the regulator in a deliberate attempt to mislead the GDC and frustrate its proper functioning.
25. The Committee has therefore determined that the facts that it has found proved at heads of charge 2, 3 (a) and 3 (b) amount to misconduct.

Impairment

26. The Committee next considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your criminal conviction, or misconduct, or both. In doing so, the Committee again exercised its own independent judgement. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has borne in mind that its overarching objective is to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, 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.

BY REASON OF CONVICTION

27. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the conviction that it has found proved at head of charge 1.
28. The Committee considers that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction with regard to public protection considerations. The Committee is mindful that the offence of which you were convicted is serious, namely stalking. The Committee notes that the seriousness of the offence is reflected by the fact that you were sentenced to a period of imprisonment, albeit suspended. The Committee has taken careful account of all of the information presented to it, including the submissions that you have made. However, it finds that you have not demonstrated that you have remedied in full your underlying behaviour. The Committee considers that you do not appear to have a detailed understanding of how your offending behaviour might impact on the safety and wellbeing of the public, as well as wider public interest considerations. The Committee considers in particular that there is an absence of targeted reflection and learning regarding how your conviction affects the safety

and wellbeing of the public. The Committee notes that you have complied with the terms of your sentence, and that you have engaged with this hearing, but it is not satisfied that it can be said that the risk of you repeating your offending behaviour is highly unlikely.

29. The Committee considers that a finding of impairment is, nonetheless, required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. In the Committee's judgement the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the serious nature of your conviction.
30. Accordingly, the Committee finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction by reference to public protection and public interest considerations.

BY REASON OF MISCONDUCT

31. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found in respect of heads of charge 2, 3 (a) and 3 (b).
32. The Committee had particular regard to the following passages from the GDC's *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026):

35. *'It is a fundamental requirement under the Standards that registrants are honest. Honesty is of key importance in protecting the public and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the professions.'*

36. *As a result, findings of dishonesty against a registrant are at the higher end of the scale of seriousness, even where it has not involved harm to patients, and even if it is unlikely to be repeated [...].*

43. *Where dishonesty is found, a finding of impairment is likely to follow [...].*

82. *Dental professionals are required to inform the GDC immediately if they are subject to criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is made against them anywhere in the world. GDC guidance sets out the circumstances in which registrants must inform the GDC of criminal proceedings or regulatory findings.*

83. *Failure to inform the GDC immediately of criminal proceedings or a regulatory finding is a serious matter. That is because failure to declare information about criminal proceedings or regulatory findings deprives the Registrar of the ability to consider the impact of those proceedings on the registrant's fitness to practise, and whether any action (including on an interim basis) needs to be taken to protect the public or the wider public interest. As a result, failure to declare criminal or regulatory proceedings has the potential to undermine the integrity of the register.*

84. *In addition, depending on the circumstances, a registrant may gain an advantage from failure to inform the GDC of criminal or regulatory proceedings. In those circumstances, such a failure may also give rise to allegations of misconduct, such as dishonesty or a lack of integrity on part of the registrant, which would further raise the seriousness of the misconduct.*

85. *A finding that a registrant dishonestly failed to inform the GDC of criminal or regulatory findings is likely to call into question that registrant's suitability to remain on the register.'*

33. The Committee considers that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct with regard to public protection considerations. The Committee is mindful that it may be more difficult to remedy dishonest conduct than, say, clinical failings. Having had regard to the information and submissions that you have provided, the Committee is not

satisfied that you fully understand the deleterious effect that dishonest conduct has on your fitness to practise. The Committee has been provided with very little information to demonstrate your assertions that you understand the harm that can be caused to the public and to the public interest from dishonest conduct. In particular, the Committee has been provided with no evidence to illustrate that you have reflected upon, have insight into, and have remediated, your dishonest conduct. You have not demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Committee how you would act differently in the future. The Committee is therefore not satisfied that a repeat of your dishonest conduct is highly unlikely.

34. The Committee considers that a finding of impairment is, nonetheless, required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. In the Committee's judgement the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the serious nature of your misconduct, relating as it does to dishonesty towards your regulator. Your conduct has brought the reputation of the profession into disrepute.
35. Accordingly, the Committee finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct with regard to public protection and public interest considerations.

Sanction

36. The Committee then determined what sanction, if any, is appropriate in light of the findings of facts, misconduct and impairment that it has made. The Committee recognises that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have such an effect, but is instead imposed to protect patients and safeguard the wider public interests mentioned above.
37. In reaching its decision the Committee has again taken into account the GDC's *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026). The Committee has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests. The Committee has once more exercised its own independent judgement.
38. The Committee has paid careful regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors present in this case.
39. In respect of the mitigating factors that are present, the Committee notes that you have no fitness to practise history; that you have expressed some limited remorse, insight and apology; and that there have been no reports of any concerns since the events giving rise to these proceedings.
40. The Committee has again had regard to the testimonial letters submitted on your behalf from professional colleagues and personal acquaintances from July 2024, which appear to have been written pursuant to your sentencing at court. The Committee found that it could not apportion particular weight to these testimonials, as they predate the facts giving rise to its finding of misconduct.
41. In terms of aggravating factors, the Committee notes that your offending behaviour caused harm to the victim in question; that your dishonest conduct was premeditated; that your dishonest conduct constitutes a breach of the trust that the GDC placed in you; that your dishonest conduct was sustained over a period of nearly three months; that your failure to notify the GDC immediately of your conviction represents a blatant and wilful disregard of the GDC's regulatory mechanisms; and that you lack significant insight into your conviction and misconduct.
42. The Committee has considered the range of sanctions available to it, starting with the least restrictive. In the light of its findings, the Committee considers that taking no action or issuing a reprimand would not be sufficient in the particular circumstances of this case. In the

Committee's judgement the safety of the public, and public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if no action were taken or if a reprimand were issued.

43. The Committee next considered whether it would be appropriate to conclude the case with a direction of conditional registration. The Committee considers that a direction of conditional registration would not adequately address the findings that it has made, given that those findings relate to a criminal conviction and a failure to notify the GDC of the same, with an associated finding of dishonesty. The Committee considers that conditions would not be practicable, and would not be capable of securing the necessary degrees of protection for the public and the public interest.
44. The Committee next considered whether to direct a period of suspended registration. After careful consideration, the Committee has determined that a direction of suspended registration is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose in the particular circumstances of this case. The Committee considers that any lesser sanction would be insufficient to protect the public and safeguard the wider public interest considerations that it has identified. The Committee considers that you have not shown significant insight in your conduct, and that you are liable to repeat that conduct.
45. The Committee has determined that the appropriate and proportionate length of your suspension is 12 months' duration. The Committee considers that this period of time is commensurate with its findings, and is likely to be required by you to demonstrate adequate insight into and remediation of your misconduct and offending criminal behaviour. The Committee directs that this period of suspended registration be reviewed prior to its expiry.
46. The Committee did consider whether a higher sanction such as a period of erasure would be appropriate. It considered that no higher sanction than that of suspension is needed to address the public protection and public considerations referred to above. The Committee considered in particular that, although its findings are serious, it does not consider that you possess a harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problem which might indicate erasure from the register. As such, a direction of erasure would be disproportionate.
47. Although the Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the future reviewing PCC which will review your suspension in approximately 12 months' time, that Committee may be assisted by you continuing to engage with these proceedings, and by producing evidence of your insight into, and remediation of, your misconduct and offending behaviour, including but not limited to focused and targeted continuing professional development (CPD).

Existing interim order

48. In accordance with Rule 21 (3) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 and section 36P (10) of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act') the interim order of conditions in place on your registration is hereby revoked.

Immediate order of suspension

49. Having directed that your name be suspended from the register, the Committee now invites submissions as whether to impose an order for your immediate suspension in accordance with section 36U of the Act.
-

Determination on immediate order – 8 April 2026

50. The Committee has again had regard to the GDC's *Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees* (January 2026). The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.
51. Ms Rawlings on behalf of the GDC submitted that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest.
52. You made no submissions on the matter.
53. In all the circumstances, the Committee considers that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The Committee has determined that, given the risks to the public and the public interest that it has identified, it would not be appropriate to permit you to practise before the substantive direction of suspension takes effect. The Committee considers that an immediate order for suspension is proportionate, and is consistent with the findings that it has set out in its foregoing determination.
54. The effect of the foregoing determination and this immediate order is that your registration will be suspended from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served upon you. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive direction of suspension will be recorded in the register 28 days from the date of deemed service. Should you decide to exercise your right of appeal, this immediate order of suspension will remain in place until the resolution of any appeal.
55. That concludes this case.