

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

27 February 2026

Name: ABDOLLAHI, Abbas

Registration number: 74512

Case number: CAS-196630- Z6B5M2

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

Registrant: Present
Represented by Stephen Henderson (lay representative)

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Conditions extended (with a review)

Duration: 12 months

Committee members: Andy Waite (Lay)(Chair)
Smita Rajani (Dentist)
Alexandra Ward (Dental Care Professional)

Legal adviser: Valerie Paterson

Committee Secretary: Andrew Keeling

Mr Abdollahi,

1. This was a review hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) in accordance with Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing has been for this PCC to review your case and determine what action to take in relation to your registration.
2. You were present at the hearing, and you were represented by Mr Stephen Henderson, a dentist and colleague. Miss Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

Background

3. Your case was first considered by a PCC at a hearing in October and December 2023. That Committee found proved, following a number of admissions by you, that between 24 February 2020 and 8 March 2021, in your capacity as a principal dentist following a Care Quality Commission ("CQC") inspection on 24 February 2020 at your practice, service of a Warning Notice from the CQC dated 3 March 2020, and a Requirement Notice dated 9 April 2020, you failed to adhere to laws, regulations, standards and guidance in respect of medical emergencies, infection control, radiology and good governance. That Committee further found proved, and which you admitted, that your actions put patient safety and/or staff safety at risk.
4. That Committee determined that the facts found proved amounted to misconduct. In respect of impairment, that Committee determined that you had not demonstrated sufficient insight into and remediation of your misconduct. In conclusion, that Committee determined that:

"In short, the Committee's findings suggest a pattern of behaviour, the lessons of which you do not yet appear to have learnt in full. The Committee has heard that you have experienced difficulties in remediating your failings during the Covid pandemic, but the Committee does not consider that this accounts for the shortcomings in your insight and remediation that it has identified. You continue to pose a risk to the public as a result of failings which have not been addressed to the extent required through reflection and remediation. Accordingly, the Committee finds that your fitness to practise is currently impaired.

The Committee also finds that a finding of impairment is required in order to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process. In the Committee's judgment public trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulator, would be seriously undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in the particular circumstances of this case."

5. In respect of sanction, that Committee determined that:

“The Committee then went on to consider whether to suspend your registration. After careful consideration, the Committee determined that a period of suspended registration is the appropriate and proportionate outcome in the particular circumstances of this case. The Committee has identified repetition of your misconduct, both in terms of your acts and omissions across multiple areas of clinical practice and in terms of the warning given to you. Your insight and remediation are both incomplete and you are at significant risk of repeating your misconduct. You have completed relevant courses but have failed to embed your knowledge into your practice. You have had ample opportunity to remediate your failings and have failed to do so.”

6. Accordingly, your registration was suspended for a period of nine months with a review hearing before its expiry. That Committee considered nine months was required to mark the seriousness of its findings. It also considered that a future reviewing Committee would be assisted by a detailed reflective statement written by you regarding this Committee’s findings and also evidence of your learning being embedded in your practice.
7. Your case was reviewed at a PCC hearing on 23 August 2024 and 6 September 2024. You attended the hearing and you were legally represented. At that hearing, the Committee found that your fitness to practise remained impaired. That Committee concluded that although your insight was developing and you had taken some steps of remediation, this was not yet sufficient and there remained a risk of repetition of your conduct such that you continued to pose a risk to patients. The Committee determined, therefore, that your fitness to practice remained impaired on public protection grounds.
8. Furthermore, that Committee determined that a finding of current impairment was also required in the public interest. That Committee was of the view that owing to the seriousness of your misconduct and as your remediation and insight was not yet sufficient, public confidence in the profession would be undermined if such a finding were not made.
9. In respect of sanction, that Committee was of the view that a conditions of practice order would allow you the opportunity to embed your learning and developing insight into your clinical practice. It considered that to impose a further period of suspension would be disproportionate and unnecessarily punitive in light of the remediation you had undertaken.
10. That Committee, therefore, determined to terminate the suspension order and impose conditions on your registration for a period of 18 months, with a review hearing before the expiry of the order. These conditions included the requirements for a reporter to provide reports to the GDC in respect of the failings found proved at the substantive hearing and for you to develop and update a Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP) to assist you in embedding your learning into your clinical practice.

11. The conditions of practice order is due to expire on 3 April 2026.

Today's Review

12. It was the role of the Committee today to undertake a comprehensive review of this case. In so doing, the Committee had careful regard to all the documentary evidence before it and the submissions made by both parties. The Committee also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee had regard to the GDC's document, *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees'* (6 January 2026) (*'the GDC's Guidance'*).
13. Miss Bagott, on behalf of the GDC, took the Committee through the background to the case. She reminded the Committee that the burden was on you to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer currently impaired. She submitted that you have been engaging with the conditions imposed on you. She referred the Committee to all the remediation evidence you have provided, including the latest report from your reporter, which stated that you had addressed all the areas of concerns raised at the substantive hearing.
14. Miss Bagott informed the Committee that you had only begun working under the conditions in July 2025. In December 2025, you appeared before the Interim Orders Committee (IOC) in respect of another matter that pre-dated the substantive hearing in this case (October 2023). However, owing to the stringent conditions imposed by the IOC in December 2025, you have been unable to work since that IOC hearing. Miss Bagott confirmed that no new concerns have been raised since you have been practising under the substantive conditions in this case.
15. Miss Bagott acknowledged the positive steps you have undertaken in remediation, however, she submitted that you have only been working under the conditions for six months. She submitted that this is insufficient time to demonstrate that your learning and remediation have been fully embedded into your clinical practice. She submitted that the previous reviewing Committee imposed a conditions of practice order for 18 months for a reason, in that this was the length of time required for you to show that you had fully remediated the concerns, and that you have only worked for a third of that period. She therefore invited the Committee to conclude that your fitness to practise remained impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds. She submitted that owing to the seriousness of your misconduct, public confidence in the profession would be undermined if impairment was not found in the circumstances of this case.
16. Miss Bagott invited the Committee to continue the conditions of practice order for a further period of 12 months. She submitted that this was an appropriate and proportionate period to show that your remediation and insight have fully been embedded into your clinical practice.

17. Mr Henderson, on your behalf, informed the Committee that you had found it difficult to obtain a job since the previous review hearing imposed the conditions on your registration. However, you managed to find work as an Associate Dentist at a private practice and worked there until December 2025. He submitted that following the IOC hearing and the imposition of interim conditions on your registration in respect of the separate matter (as referred to above by Miss Bagott), which included the close supervision of your practice, you were unable to continue your role at the private practice. He submitted, however, that the concerns dealt with at the IOC hearing predated the substantive hearing in this case.
18. Mr Henderson referred the Committee to your remediation evidence, which included the reports from your reporter, your Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP), targeted Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training with written reflections on the courses undertaken and your written reflections in general on the concerns in this case. He submitted that you recognised that things went badly wrong in your own practice and you accepted the CQC's findings and their seriousness. You addressed these matters by closing your own practice and you do not intend to own a practice in future. However, he submitted, that does not mean that you do not take clinical governance seriously whilst working as an Associate Dentist.
19. Mr Henderson acknowledged that you have only been working under these conditions for a period of six months. However, he submitted that your remediation work and developing insight has been ongoing for much longer, including the period of suspension following the initial hearing. He submitted that it would not be in the public interest to deprive the public of a good dentist. He submitted that a well-informed member of the public would not be unduly concerned if a finding of impairment were not made given the period of suspension you have already served, the period of conditions imposed and the remediation work undertaken.
20. Mr Henderson, therefore, invited the Committee to find that your fitness to practise is no longer currently impaired.

Decision on Current Impairment

21. In making its decision, the Committee first sought to determine whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct. It exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decision of the previous committee. It balanced your interests with those of the public and bore in mind that its primary duty is to protect the public, including maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour.
22. The Committee carefully considered all of the material in this case, which included the findings of the substantive and reviewing Committees, the remediation evidence you have provided and your submissions today. The Committee noted that you have only worked for six months under the conditions, between July and December 2025. However, it took account of the reports from your reporter, which showed that you had

complied with the conditions and no further concerns have been raised. It considered the CPD training you have undertaken, including the training undertaken whilst you were suspended previously, and considered these to be targeted and relevant to the concerns in this case. Furthermore, the Committee noted your numerous written reflections and found that you have reflected thoroughly on the CQC findings and that you possessed good insight into these matters.

23. The Committee, however, was mindful of its role to protect the public. Despite all the remediation work undertaken, which the Committee commends you for, you have only been able to work clinically under the conditions for six months. The Committee, therefore, could not be satisfied that your remediation and learning has been fully embedded in your practice such that there would be no risk of repetition of the concerns found proved. The Committee also took into account that the previous reviewing Committee had determined that 18 months would be sufficient time to show that you had fully remediated the concerns. Whilst this Committee was mindful that it was looking at matters afresh, the Committee considered that this period was significant given your serious failings in respect of clinical governance and the impact this could have on patient safety and the safety of dental colleagues. The Committee determined, therefore, that there remained a risk to patient safety, albeit the risk was low given your remediation and insight.
24. Accordingly, the Committee determined that a finding of current impairment remains necessary to protect the public.
25. In respect of the public interest, the Committee concluded that a well-informed member of the public would consider that public confidence in the profession would be undermined if a finding of impairment was not made in circumstances where your remediation and learning has not been fully embedded in your clinical practice.
26. Accordingly, the Committee determined that a finding of current impairment was required in the public interest.

Decision on Sanction

27. The Committee next considered what sanction to impose on your registration.
28. The Committee first considered whether it would be appropriate to allow the current order to lapse at its expiry or to terminate it with immediate effect. The Committee determined that it would not be appropriate to terminate the current order or to allow it to lapse, given that it has found that your fitness to practise remains currently impaired. Terminating the conditions of practice order would neither protect the public nor satisfy the wider public interest considerations in this case.
29. For the reasons already given, the Committee determined that the continued restriction of your registration remains necessary for the protection of the public and to maintain

public confidence in the profession. Having regard to all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that the conditions currently on your registration remain workable and appropriate as you have worked well under the conditions for a period of six months. The Committee considered whether to impose a suspension order on your registration, but determined that this would be disproportionate given the remediation work you have undertaken. The Committee noted that you are not currently working owing to the IOC conditions imposed on your registration in December 2025. However, it did not consider this to be relevant or appropriate to its decision-making in this case as they related to separate ongoing proceedings.

30. The Committee concluded that your conditional registration should be extended for a further period of 12 months. It was satisfied that this period of time would be sufficient for you to continue to embed your learning and remediation into your clinical practice. It further noted that you have previously complied with the conditions whilst you were working and was satisfied that you would do so in future. It therefore determined to continue the current conditions unvaried.
31. Accordingly, the Committee directs that the current period of conditional registration be extended for a period of 12 months pursuant to Section 27C (2)(b) of the Dentists Act 1984, as amended. The conditions remain unvaried. The Committee also directs a review hearing before the expiry of the order.
32. The conditions, as they will appear against your name in the Dentists Register are:
 1. *He must work with a Postgraduate Dental Dean/Director (or a nominated deputy), to formulate a Personal Professional Development Plan, specifically designed to address the deficiencies in his adherence to the laws, regulations, standards and guidance in respect of:*
 - *medical emergencies,*
 - *infection control,*
 - *radiology, and*
 - *good governance.*
 2. *He must forward a copy of this Personal Professional Development Plan to the GDC within three months of the date on which these conditions become effective.*
 3. *He must meet with the Postgraduate Dental Dean/Director (or a nominated deputy), on a regular basis to discuss his progress towards achieving the aims set out in his Personal Professional Development Plan. The frequency of his meetings is to be set by the Postgraduate Dental Dean/Director (or a nominated deputy).*
 4. *He must allow the GDC to exchange information about the standard of his professional performance and his progress towards achieving the aims set out in his Personal Professional Development Plan with the Postgraduate Dental*



Dean/Director (or a nominated deputy), and any other person involved in his retraining and supervision.

- 5. He must notify the GDC promptly of any professional appointment he accepts and provide the contact details of his employer or any organisation for which he is contracted to provide dental services and the Commissioning Body on whose Dental Performers List he is included.*
- 6. He must allow the GDC to exchange information with his employer or any organisation for which he is contracted to provide dental services, and any Postgraduate Dental Dean/Director (or a nominated deputy) or reporter, referred to in these conditions.*
- 7. At any time he is providing dental services, which require him to be registered with the GDC, he must agree to the appointment of a reporter nominated by him and approved by the GDC. The reporter shall be a GDC registrant.*
- 8. He must allow the reporter to provide reports to the GDC at intervals of not more than four months and the GDC will make these reports available to any Postgraduate Dental Dean/Director (or a nominated deputy) referred to in these conditions.*
- 9. He must inform the GDC of any formal disciplinary proceedings taken against him, from the date of this determination.*
- 10. He must inform the GDC if he applies for dental employment outside the UK.*
- 11. He must not be responsible for the administration/management of any dental practice.*
- 12. He must engage in dental practice only at a practice he does not own or control.*
- 13. He must not work as a locum or undertake any out-of-hours work or on-call duties without the prior agreement of the GDC.*
- 14. He must inform within one week the following parties that his registration is subject to the conditions, listed at (1) to (13), above:*
 - Any organisation or person employing or contracting with him to undertake dental work;*
 - Any locum agency or out-of-hours service he is registered with or applies to be registered with (at the time of application);*
 - Any prospective employer (at the time of application);*
 - The Commissioning Body on whose Dental Performers List he is included or seeking inclusion.*

15. He must permit the GDC to disclose the above conditions, (1) to (14), to any person requesting information about his registration status.

33. That concludes this hearing today.