

PRIVATE HEARING

Health Committee Review Hearing

17 June 2026

Name: ELLIS, Chloe Freya

Registration number: 296680

Case number: CAS-203533-Z4X4V8

General Dental Council: Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel
Instructed by IHLPS

Registrant: Not present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of adverse health

Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)

Duration: 12 months

Committee members: Debbie Jones (Chair, Dental Care Professional member)
Annika Hindocha (Dentist member)
Jane Jones (Lay member)

Legal adviser: Alexander Coleman

Committee Secretary: Sara Page

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

2. The purpose of today's hearing is to review a substantive direction of suspension first imposed on Miss Ellis' registration by the Health Committee (HC) on 11 June 2025. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 36Q of '*Dentists Act 1984*' (as amended), 'the Act'.
3. 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.
4. Miss Ellis was not present at the hearing and unrepresented.
5. Ms Peta-Louise Bagott, Case Presenter, appeared on behalf of the GDC.

Application for the hearing to be held in private

6. At the beginning of the hearing, Ms Bagott made an application under Rule 53 of the '*General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*' ('the Rules') that this hearing be held entirely in private since the matters under consideration relate to Miss Ellis' health.
7. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, due to the nature of the matters in this case, and having regard to the information before it, the Committee was satisfied that the personal interests of Miss Ellis outweighed the public interest in this case.
8. The Committee therefore determined that the hearing should be held in private, and directed that two versions of the determination be made available, with appropriate redactions made to the public version.

Decision and reasons on service of Notice of Hearing

9. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Miss Ellis was neither present nor represented at today's hearing.
10. In her absence, the Committee first considered whether the Notice of Hearing ('the Notice') had been served on Miss Ellis in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the '*General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*' ('the Rules').
11. The Committee had regard to the indexed hearing bundle of 112 pages, which contained a copy of the Notice, dated 29 April 2026. The Notice was sent to Miss Ellis' registered address by Special Delivery and First Class post on 29 April 2026, in accordance with Section 50A of the '*Dentists Act 1984*' (as amended) ('the Act') and via email on the same date.
12. The Committee was satisfied that the Notice contained proper and correct information relating to today's hearing. This included the time, date and that it is being conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams, as well as notification that the Committee has the power to proceed with the hearing in Miss Ellis' absence.

13. Whilst it is not a requirement of the Rules, the Committee had sight of an extract from the Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' service which showed the item was delivered to Miss Ellis' registered address on 30 April 2026. It was signed for against the initials 'CE'.
14. In light of the information available, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Ellis has been served with proper notification of this hearing, at least 28 days before its commencement, in accordance with the Rules.

Decision and reasons on proceeding in the absence of Miss Ellis

15. Pursuant to Rule 54, the Committee next considered Ms Bagott's application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Ellis and any representative on her behalf. The Committee was mindful that its decision to proceed in the absence of Miss Ellis must be handled with the utmost care and caution. The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee of the requirement to be fair to both parties, as well as considering the public interest in the expeditious disposal of this case.
16. Ms Bagott submitted that all reasonable efforts had been made to notify Miss Ellis of today's review and referred the Committee to the relevant documents in the bundle where this was evident. Ms Bagott submitted that there was documentation to demonstrate that Miss Ellis had downloaded the Notice emailed to her on 29 April 2026. She further submitted that six attempts had been made to Miss Ellis' mobile telephone number. However, Miss Ellis has not responded to any of the 'missed calls' or to the voicemail that was left. Ms Bagott stated that there has not been any engagement by Miss Ellis in relation to today's hearing and, as a consequence, there was no reason to believe that an adjournment would secure her attendance on some future occasion.
17. The Committee acknowledged that Miss Ellis has not engaged with the GDC in relation to today's review hearing and has not requested an adjournment of these proceedings. On the basis of the information before it, the Committee concluded that Miss Ellis had voluntarily absented herself from today's hearing.
18. In all these circumstances, the Committee determined that it was fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Ellis in order to conduct a full review of the existing substantive order before its expiry on 13 July 2026.

Background

19. This is the first review of a substantive order initially imposed by the HC on Miss Ellis' registration on 16 June 2025.
20. At the initial substantive hearing, the HC found Miss Ellis' fitness to practise impaired by reason of her adverse health. [PRIVATE].
21. The HC directed that Miss Ellis' registration be subject to a suspension for a period of 12 months with a review, stating:

'...Given Miss Ellis' lack of meaningful engagement to date, the Committee concluded that it could not formulate any workable conditions at this stage. It was not confident that Miss Ellis would comply with any conditions that could be imposed. In the circumstances, the Committee determined that conditional registration would not be appropriate or proportionate.'

Accordingly, the Committee determined to impose a suspension order on Miss Ellis' registration. A suspension order is the highest sanction available, given that this case relates solely to matters of health.

The Committee directs that Miss Ellis' registration be suspended for a period of 12 months. It considered that a 12-month period is proportionate in all the circumstances, to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the dental profession. The Committee took account of the seriousness of its outstanding concerns and the lack of any meaningful engagement by Miss Ellis with the fitness to practise process. [PRIVATE].

The Committee also directs a review of the suspension order. This means that a resumed hearing in respect of Miss Ellis' case will be held shortly before the expiry of the 12-month period. At that hearing, a Health committee will consider what action should be taken in respect of Miss Ellis' registration at that time. She will be informed of the date and time of the resumed hearing.

This Committee considered that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by receiving the following:

- *Evidence of Miss Ellis' meaningful engagement with the GDC.*
- *[PRIVATE].*

Submissions

22. Ms Bagott, on behalf of the GDC, invited the Committee to extend the current order of suspension for a further period of 12 months as Miss Ellis' fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of both public protection and in the public interest. She reminded the Committee that the persuasive burden lies with Miss Ellis to demonstrate that she has addressed her past impairment but that through her failure to engage with the GDC or provide up-to-date evidence of her health [PRIVATE] she has failed to do so.
23. In the absence of any information from Miss Ellis relating to her adverse health, Ms Bagott referred the Committee to the evidence contained within the GDC's bundle, [PRIVATE], Ms Bagott submitted [PRIVATE] that Miss Ellis cannot demonstrate that her fitness to practise is no longer impaired on the ground of adverse health.
24. Ms Bagott also reminded the Committee to consider the public interest and that for the reasons already cited, a well-informed member of the public would be troubled if Miss Ellis were permitted to return to unrestricted practice. Taking both limbs together, Ms Bagott submitted that in the absence of any engagement, Miss Ellis has been unable to discharge the burden of demonstrating that her fitness to practise is not currently impaired.
25. On the matter of sanction, Ms Bagott submitted that given the ongoing concerns, the sanction that is necessary and appropriate is a continuation of the suspension in order to protect the public and maintain public confidence in the profession. In this regard, she invited the Committee to extend the suspension order for 12 months, with a review, to give Miss Ellis further opportunity to re-engage with the GDC and to provide evidence to the reviewing HC of her insight and up-to-date information regarding her health.
26. Miss Ellis has not engaged with the GDC and has not provided any written submissions in her absence to be considered by the Committee today for the purposes of this review.

Decision and reasons on today's review

27. The Committee has carefully considered all the information presented to it, including the documentation and submissions provided by the GDC. In its deliberations, the Committee has had regard to the GDC's '*Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (11 January 2026)*', 'the Guidance'. The Committee has heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Impairment

28. The Committee first considered whether Miss Ellis' fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her adverse health.
29. In reaching its decision, the Committee was mindful of the need to protect the public and to maintain public confidence in the profession.
30. In consideration of Miss Ellis' current fitness to practise, the Committee noted that since the order was imposed she has not engaged with the GDC. [PRIVATE]. There is no more recent information than this and the Committee concluded that in the absence of such information, that Miss Ellis [PRIVATE] remains a significant risk of harm to patients. [PRIVATE]. Therefore, the Committee determined that Miss Ellis' fitness to practise remains impaired on the ground of public protection.
31. The Committee also determined that due to the ongoing concerns relating to public protection, that public confidence on the profession and the GDC as its regulator would be undermined were Miss Ellis permitted to practise without restriction and therefore concluded that her fitness to practise also remained impaired on the ground of public interest.

Sanction

32. In coming to its decision on sanction, the Committee took account of the options available to it at this stage, namely:
- to terminate the suspension;
 - to extend the period of suspension for a period of up to 12 months, starting from the date on which it would otherwise expire; or,
 - to revoke the order of suspension and replace it with conditions of registration for up to three years.
33. The Committee considered whether Miss Ellis should be permitted to return to restricted practice under the provision of conditions of practice. However, in the absence of any engagement with the GDC or any evidence that Miss Ellis would be willing to comply with conditional registration, the Committee determined that conditions of practice would be unworkable. [PRIVATE], there are no conditions that could be formulated at this time that would be able to appropriately address Miss Ellis' adverse health so as to adequately address the public protection and public interest concerns identified
34. Therefore, the Committee was satisfied that the appropriate and proportionate sanction was a further suspension for a period of 12 months, with a review. This period would allow Miss Ellis time to re-engage with the GDC and provide up-to-date information regarding her health [PRIVATE].
35. The suspension order will be reviewed before it expires at which a reviewing HC will be able to assess any further evidence provided by Miss Ellis. The future reviewing HC may be assisted by the following:

- Evidence of Miss Ellis' meaningful re-engagement with the GDC.
- [PRIVATE].

Right of appeal

36. Miss Ellis will have 28 days from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served on her to appeal against it. Should she decide to appeal, the existing direction of suspension will remain in force until the resolution of any such appeal. Should she decide not to appeal, the suspension order will take effect on the date on which the current suspension order would otherwise expire, that is to say on 13 July 2026.
37. That will be confirmed to Miss Ellis in writing.
38. That concludes this determination.

PUBLIC