

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

7 April 2026

Name: JAN, Akhtar
Registration number: 62106
Case number: CAS-194669-N2Z0Z9

General Dental Council: Miss Peta-Louise Bagott, counsel.
Instructed by Georgina Mayles, IHLPS

Registrant: Not present
Not represented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Conditions revoked and suspension imposed (with a review)

Duration: 12 months

Immediate order: suspension

Committee members: Clive Powell (Lay) (Chair)
Robin Barber (Dentist)
Donna Lightbody (DCP)

Legal adviser: Mark Sullivan

Committee Secretary: Sarah Crewe

Purpose of hearing

1. The purpose of this hearing is to carry out a statutory review of an order of conditions on Mr Jan's registration. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

Service of Notice of Hearing

2. The Committee was informed at the start of this hearing that Mr Jan was not in attendance nor was he represented. In his absence, the Committee first considered whether the notice of this hearing had been served on Mr Jan in accordance with rules 28 and 65 of *the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006 (the Rules)*.
3. The Committee received a copy of the Notification of Resumed Hearing which was dated as sent to Mr Jan's registered address via Special Delivery on 4 March 2026. The notice was also sent via first class post and secure email.
4. The Committee had sight of an extract from the Royal Mail Track and Trace service (track and trace) which shows that the notice was delivered on 27 March 2027, following two previous attempts to deliver on 6 and 21 March 2026. However, the Committee reminded itself that the relevant date for the purpose of its considerations today is the date of sending and not the date of delivery.
5. In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that the notice had been served in compliance with the rules.

Proceeding in the absence of Mr Jan:

6. The Committee then considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 to proceed in the absence of Mr Jan. The Committee heard the submissions made by Miss Bagott on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee bore in mind that it must exercise the utmost care and caution when considering whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in Mr Jan's absence. It has also borne in mind the overall fairness of the proceedings to both parties, as well as the public interest in the timely review of this case.
7. Miss Bagott outlined the background to this case, including the correspondence sent to Mr Jan and his response, including that he has parted ways with his representatives and no information has been forthcoming regarding any new representatives.
8. Miss Bagott submitted that, having regard to the information before the Committee, it would be appropriate to proceed in the absence of Mr Jan. She submitted that Mr Jan has voluntarily absented himself.
9. The GDC had sight of an email, dated 31 March 2026, from Mr Jan in response to the notice of hearing. In this he confirms that he is aware of the hearing and will not be attending.
10. The Committee weighed Mr Jan's interests against the need to protect the public and uphold the public interest. Mr Jan has not made any request for an adjournment and the Committee considered that it was essential to review the existing order before it lapsed to ensure that the public would not be put at risk. The current order is due to expire on 7 May 2026.

11. The Committee was satisfied that the public interest in this respect outweighed Mr Jan's interests and determined to proceed in his absence.

Factual background

12. In April 2023 the PCC considered allegations relating to Mr Jan's conduct. The misconduct found by that PCC related to Mr Jan's failures as practice principal to adhere to laws, regulations, standards and policies in respect of the Disposal of clinical waste, Emergency medical equipment, Decontamination procedures, and Health and safety requirements, including immunisations, Legionella risks assessments and staff risk assessment. These failures were identified by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) at inspections of Mr Jan's practice on 27 February 2019 and 2 July 2019, following which the CQC made the decision to cancel his clinic's registration. In finding misconduct, the April 2023 PCC '*noted that there was a pattern of failure to adhere to current laws, regulations, standards and policies over an extended period and was satisfied that these failures had the potential to result in patient harm*'.
13. That PCC determined that the facts found proved amounted to misconduct, and that Mr Jan's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of that misconduct. At the initial hearing Mr Jan was placed under a conditions of practice order for a period of 12 months with a review.
14. The PCC reviewed the order of conditions on 25 April 2024. It was submitted by the GDC that Mr Jan had breached his conditions. The PCC determined that due to Mr Jan's failure to comply with all of the conditions and his lack of a satisfactory level of engagement and communication with the GDC conditions were no longer workable. The PCC replaced the conditions of practice order with a suspension order for 6 months and directed a review.
15. A second review took place in October 2024. Mr Jan attended that hearing and made submissions inviting the Committee to revoke the suspension order and stated that he did not accept the findings of the initial Committee in 2023. At that review hearing the Committee determined that Mr Jan's fitness to practice remained impaired but revoked the suspension order and replaced it with a conditions of practice order for a period of 18 months.

Current review hearing

16. This Committee has comprehensively reviewed the conditions of practice order. In so doing, it has had regard to the GDC's bundle of documents as well as the submissions from Miss Bagott. Mr Jan has not positively engaged with the GDC and has not provided any information for this Committee to consider as part of the review.

Submissions

17. Miss Bagott outlined the background of this case and summarised the previous decisions made at the initial PCC hearing and the subsequent reviews. She submitted that Mr Jan has not provided any evidence of remediation or insight since the last review. Miss Bagott referred the Committee to the attempts made by the GDC to contact Mr Jan regarding the matters that the previous Committees had outlined and the required documentation as per his conditions. No response was forthcoming.
18. The GDC's position is that Mr Jan's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of his misconduct, and that a further period of conditions would serve no useful purpose given the lack of engagement. She submitted that it would be proportionate to revoke the conditions of practice order and impose a suspension order for 6 months.

19. Miss Bagott submitted that the lack of engagement from Mr Jan demonstrates a lack of insight and there is no information of any meaningful attempts to remediate his misconduct in compliance with his conditions. Therefore, Miss Bagott submitted that there remains a risk to the public given the wilful disregard for the role of the regulator.
20. Miss Bagott submitted that the public's confidence would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the circumstances of this case. She submitted that Mr Jan's fitness to practise remains impaired on public interest grounds.
21. In looking at the possible sanctions available to this Committee Miss Bagott outlined the position of the GDC and summarised why it is said that a suspension order is the most appropriate and proportionate sanction.
22. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Current Impairment

23. The Committee was mindful that there is a persuasive burden on the registrant to demonstrate that their fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The Committee considered that there has been a material change of circumstances since the last PCC review hearing in that Mr Jan is no longer engaging with the GDC and not complying with his conditions. Mr Jan has not engaged with these proceedings and has produced no evidence of any insight into or remediation of his misconduct. The Committee concluded that Mr Jan therefore continues to pose a risk to the public
24. Whilst the Committee considered that the misconduct found in 2023 was potentially remediable there is no up to date evidence of any efforts made by Mr Jan since the last review to undertake relevant and appropriate remediation. The Committee had no up to date evidence before it to be able to assess Mr Jan's level of insight.
25. As a result of the above, the Committee concluded that Mr Jan's fitness to practise remains currently impaired on public protection grounds.
26. The Committee also considers that a further finding of impairment is required to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour, and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process.

Sanction

27. The Committee then considered what, if any, sanction to impose in this case. The Committee was aware of the range of sanctions available to it and that it must consider the sanctions in order from the least serious.
28. The Committee was aware that it should have regard to the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against Mr Jan's own interests. The public interest includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding standards of conduct and performance within the profession.
29. The Committee noted its powers outlined in the Act. The Committee had the power to extend the current order for a maximum period of 36 months. Alternatively, it could revoke the

conditions of practice order or allow it to lapse upon expiry, or it could replace the order with a suspension order for up to 12 months.

30. The Committee first considered whether it would be appropriate to allow the current order to lapse at its expiry or to revoke it with immediate effect. The Committee considered that given all of the information before it, it would be wholly inappropriate to revoke the current order or to allow it to lapse, as this would not protect the public nor would it be in the public interest.
31. The Committee then considered whether extending the conditions of practice order would be appropriate in this case. Given Mr Jan's lack of positive engagement, the lack of any current evidence of steps taken to address the misconduct and the lack of insight demonstrated by Mr Jan, the Committee considered that this would not be an appropriate order. Mr Jan has failed to provide requested audits and a reflective statement as required by his conditions, despite numerous requests from the GDC and the Committee is unaware of any reason why he could not provide this information. In the light of all the evidence, the Committee considered that conditional registration is no longer workable.
32. In all the circumstances, the Committee has therefore determined to suspend Mr Jan's registration. Whilst it had regard to the serious nature of such a sanction and the potential consequences for him, the Committee considered that the need to protect the public and the wider public interest outweighs Mr Jan's interests.
33. In the circumstances the Committee has concluded that members of the public and the wider public interest would not be sufficiently protected by a lesser sanction than suspension.
34. The Committee concluded that a suspension order for a period of 12 months, with a review, is both appropriate and proportionate. In deciding on this period, the Committee took into account Mr Jan's current position, that he intends to take this case to the High Court and he has stopped positively engaging. It noted that the GDC had asked for 6 months, however given the multiple opportunities afforded Mr Jan to positively engage it determined that a 6 month suspension would be unlikely to change his attitude towards this process. Mr Jan has continued to refuse to accept the findings of both the CQC and the initial Committee, which caused the Committee concern regarding his ongoing lack of insight. It also concluded that 12 months would ensure that the public is protected.
35. A Committee will review this case at a resumed hearing to be held shortly before the end of the period of suspension. That Committee will consider whether it should take any further action in relation to Mr Jan's registration. The Committee considers that any reviewing Committee may be assisted by evidence of Mr Jan engaging positively with his regulator, written reflection on the findings made by the initial Committee in 2023, and relevant and targeted CPD and his reflection on any learning.

Decision on an immediate order

36. In reaching its decision on whether to impose an immediate order of suspension on Mr Jan's registration, the Committee took account of the submissions made by Miss Bagott and of the GDC's Guidance for the Practice Committees. The Committee took account of all the circumstances of the case, including the need for proportionality.
37. Miss Bagott applied for an immediate order of suspension to be imposed for the protection of the public and is in the wider public interest. Miss Bagott submitted that an immediate order is necessary given the circumstances of this case and would be in line with the Committee's findings as to why it revoked the conditions of practice order and replaced it with a suspension

order. She submitted that to allow Mr Jan to remain on conditions of practice during the appeal period would be inconsistent.

38. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser who advised it on its powers under section 30 of the Dentists Act 1984 and the matters to which it should have regard.
39. The Committee was satisfied that an immediate order of suspension is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The Committee concluded that given the reasons for the substantive order of suspension in this case, to do otherwise would be inconsistent. The Committee also considered that if an immediate order was not made in the circumstances, there would be a risk to public safety and public confidence in the profession would be undermined.
40. The effect of this direction is that Mr Jan's registration will be suspended immediately. Unless he exercises his right of appeal, the substantive order of suspension will come into effect 28 days from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served on him. Should he exercise his right of appeal, this immediate order for suspension will remain in place until the resolution of any appeal.
41. That concludes this determination.