

**Hearing heard partly in private
Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing
2-6 February 2026; and
27-31 July 2026**

Name: BRIGHT, Selina
Registration number: 272261
Case number: CAS-209064-C7G9J7

General Dental Council: Abimbola Johnson, counsel
Instructed by Rochelle Williams IHLPS

Registrant: Present and unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome: Suspension (with a review)
Duration: 3 months
Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Diane Mickle (Chair, Lay)
Jeanie Suvan (Dental Care Professional)
Amit Gadhavi (Dentist)

Legal adviser: Alain Goherty

Committee Secretary: Jamie Barge

Ms Bright

1. This is an initial hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee, pursuant to section 27B of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').
2. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.
3. You are present and not represented at these proceedings. Ms Johnson, Counsel, appears on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC).

Application to amend the charge

4. Ms Johnson then made an application under Rule 18 to amend the charge in three aspects as follows;
5. To amend head of charge 2 into two parts to make it easier to read and follow, and this will be;
"You represented to the public and/or allowed a representation to be made to the public, that you were:
 - a. allowed to treat patients with tooth whitening; and/or**
 - b. had discussed this with the General Dental Council.**
6. To amend head of charge 3 to read; You represented to the public **that you were no longer registered with the General Dental Council.**
7. Finally, to amend allegation 4 so that it reads "You have caused and/or permitted the advertising of tooth whitening services **which were to be delivered by you**, and were beyond your scope of practice.
8. Ms Johnson submitted that the proposed changes were uncontroversial and provided clarity to you. She submitted these amendments could be made without injustice to you since they did not change the meaning or the way in which the GDC put its case.
9. You submitted that you do not object to the GDC's application to amend heads of charge 2, 3 and 4.
10. The Committee had regard to the submissions made by Ms Johnson and you. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
11. The Committee was satisfied that the proposed amendments as set out at head of charge 2, above, could be made without injustice. In respect of head of charge 3, the Committee notes that you had previously responded to the charge which stated your registration as being lapsed as opposed to the amended charge of being no longer registered. However, it is satisfied that this would more accurately reflect the case that you have to meet. The Committee has accepted the application and is satisfied it can be made without injustice. The Committee also allows the amendment of head of charge 4. It is satisfied that the change provides clarity. The Committee was satisfied that the amendment could be made without injustice to you.
12. However, as you have responded to these heads of charge with the previous wording. It will allow you time to re-visit your written response to these heads of charge and provide additional

responses to the newly worded charges. Accordingly, the Committee acceded to the GDC's application in respect of all three heads of charge, 2, 3 and 4.

Application for hearing to be held partly in private

13. Ms Johnson then made an application that the hearing be held partly in private under Rule 53(2)(a) since some of the matters may make reference to your health and personal life.

14. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

15. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public. However, having regard to the nature of the case, the Committee was satisfied that your personal interests outweighed the public interest in this case. It therefore determined to move into private session where reference was to be made to your health and personal life. Accordingly, it acceded to the GDC's request under Rule 53(2)(a).

Amended allegations

16. The amended allegations are as follows:

"That being registered as a dental care professional:

1) *You have advertised yourself, on social media, as a 'Registered Orthodontic Dental Nurse', when your registration number and details confirm you are a registered dental nurse.*

2) *You represented to the public and/or allowed a representation to be made to the public, that you were:*

- a) allowed to treat patients with tooth whitening; and/or*
- b) had discussed this with the General Dental Council.*

3) *You represented to the public that you were no longer registered with the General Dental Council.*

4) *You have caused and/or permitted the advertising of tooth whitening services which were to be delivered by you, and were beyond your scope of practice.*

5) *Your actions in relation to allegations 1, and/or 2 and/or 3 were;*

- a) Misleading and/or*
- b) Dishonest*

AND that by reason of the matters alleged above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Summary of the case

17. The GDC received concerns from two separate informants. These concerns included that you were advertising yourself as a registered orthodontic nurse, despite being a registered dental nurse. Witness 1 made a complaint in this respect to the GDC on 5 October 2024.

18. Further, on 30 October 2024 the GDC received a separate concern from another complainant (Witness 2). In their notification, Witness 2 was concerned that [the hair salon] was advertising your teeth whitening services. Witness 2 indicated she challenged the salon about your registration. [The

hair salon] allegedly told Witness 2 that you were no longer registered as a dental nurse, that you had a qualification from [a tooth whitening training company] and that you were insured to carry out teeth whitening.

19. The GDC's illegal practice team undertook initial enquiries and noted that you are a registered dental nurse. In particular, the team reviewed your business Instagram and Facebook pages:

- The Instagram 'selinabright.teeth_whitening' described you as "Selina Bright Cosmetic Teeth Whitening & Aesthetics", and "Influencer for Orthodontic Aligners" (accompanied by a tag for Invisalign). The page showed various pictures of you holding a whitening tray to a client's teeth, along with several 'before and after' pictures of teeth. In one post, you explained that you had been a "Registered Orthodontic Nurse for many years travelling around UK & Europe" and that you had "moved to the Aesthetic side [where you] will be offering cosmetic Teeth Whitening & further more medical grade treatments". Finally, another picture showed a client's face with the caption "starting my aligners journey".
- The Facebook page for [the hair salon] explained that it was a hairdresser based in [Southwest England]. The feed included pictures relating to hair plus various 'before and after' pictures of teeth. A post explained that customers could book for teeth whitening treatments with 'Selina'.

20. GDC guidance states that tooth whitening can only be carried out by dentists or certain Dental Care Professionals under the prescription of a dentist. Dental nurses cannot provide tooth whitening services.

21. The GDC alleges that you advertised yourself, on social media, as a 'Registered Orthodontic Dental Nurse', and that you represented to the public and/or allowed a representation to be made to the public, that you were allowed to treat patients with tooth whitening. In addition, it is alleged that you represented to the public that you were no longer registered with the General Dental Council(GDC), as well as you causing and/or permitting the advertising of a tooth whitening service which was beyond your scope of practice. That GDC alleges that your conduct as described above was both misleading and/or dishonest.

Evidence

22. The Committee has been provided with documentary material in relation to the heads of charge that you face. This material includes:

The witness statements and documentary exhibits of the following witnesses:

- Witness 1, Dental Nurse, dated 31 October 2025;
- Witness 2, Former customer at the Salon dated 5 November 2025;.
- Witness 3, GDC Caseworker dated 5 November 2025;
- Witness 4, GDC Operations Officer dated 28 October 2025, and a supplementary statement 23 January 2025;
- Witness 5, GDC Customer Advice and Information Officer dated 5 November 2025;

23. In addition, the Committee had sight of an expert report from Mr Smart dated 4 November 2025, as well as a supplementary report dated 23 January 2026. In addition it received copies of the GDC's audit history of telephone calls and contact made by you to the GDC.

24. The Committee heard oral evidence from Witnesses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and also the GDC expert witness.

25. The Committee also heard oral evidence from you. In addition, you provided a number of character testimonials from colleagues and one from your former employer.

Findings of Fact

26. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it, both documentary and oral. It took account of the submissions on the alleged facts made by Ms Johnson on behalf of the GDC. The Committee has borne in mind that you are of good character in that you have no previous fitness to practise history. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

27. The Committee considered the factual allegations separately, bearing in mind that the burden of proof rests with the GDC and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, that is, whether the alleged matters are proved on the balance of probabilities.

28. In respect of head of charge 5, the Committee applied the legal test for dishonesty, as set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67.

29. The Committee made the following findings:

1	<i>You have advertised yourself, on social media, as a 'Registered Orthodontic Dental Nurse', when your registration number and details confirm you are a registered dental nurse.</i> Admitted and found proved. The Committee notes you have admitted that you had advertised yourself as a 'Registered Orthodontic Dental Nurse'. You stated you had referred to past experience and that you did some in-house training in this respect every three months at a cosmetic company, Diamond Whites. However, you stated that the company was acquired, and there is no longer any record of your training. The Committee notes this is a dental title that does not exist in the GDC Register. It is satisfied there is evidence of various social media screen shots and correspondence to support that you had advertised yourself, on social media, as a 'Registered Orthodontic Dental Nurse', when your registration number and details confirm you are a registered dental nurse. It therefore finds this head of charge proved.
2	<i>You represented to the public and/or allowed a representation to be made to the public, that you were:</i>
2.a	<i>allowed to treat patients with tooth whitening; and/or</i> Proved.

Witness 2 messaged you on 14 October 2024 to enquire whether you were qualified to provide this type of treatment. She provided a number of screenshots of Facebook exchanges between you both.

Mr Smart, the GDC Expert stated in oral evidence that the provision of tooth whitening would come under the act of dentistry. He stated that the role of a dental nurse is different to that of a dental hygienist. He stated that a dental nurse can make the tooth whitening trays but must be under the prescription of a dentist. However, he stated only dental hygienists and dental therapists can deliver this service working under a dentist prescription. He stated that all registrants have a duty to know all GDC rules and standards.

You stated that you had been a victim of the tooth whitening company. You stated you only undertook advertising for the tooth whitening company. You stated that you never actually did tooth whitening. You also stated that you did have a 0% hydroxide tooth whitening pen, which you had given to members of your family.

You stated you never took any money, as you were aware as a dental professional you are not allowed to perform tooth whitening. Your video post was to show what you had previously done with a previous cosmetic company, and you never meant any harm to anybody. You stated that you have nothing to hide and would never do this to jeopardise your dental career.

The Committee is satisfied there is repeated documentation that you had publicly represented yourself as qualified and able to provide tooth whitening services. For example, there is evidence of a Facebook exchange between you and Witness 2 where you state *"I can operate and distribute cosmetic tooth whitening without GDC Registration"*. In addition, the Committee had sight of various screenshots of salon material referring to you, Selina Bright Cosmetic teeth whitening Anesthetics. These posts state you as having many years of experience in dentistry and you would be offering cosmetic teeth whitening with instant results within 1 hour. Also, there are your own posts stating, *"I will now be offering cosmetic teeth whitening and I will be taking bookings as of October 2024 in our family Salon"*. There are also screenshots of your social media posts inviting members of the public to call the salon to book a *"free consultation with Selina."*

The Committee also had sight of an email from your brother as Managing Director of the salon to the GDC dated 13 November 2024. In this email he stated *"I've employed Selina to be a member of my salon hair and beauty team and for her to also offer teeth whitening in my salon. Selina is fully qualified and has her certificate displayed."* Your Brother also replied on Facebook to Witness 2's concerns as follows; *"Selina was a registered dental nurse with many years in the profession, she has now gone onto the aesthetic side and undergone training with (the tooth whitening company). She is fully insured to deliver cosmetic teeth whitening alongside her aesthetic beauty treatments"*.

The Committee is satisfied that the above documentation is contemporaneous and demonstrate how your tooth whitening services were being advertised to members of the public. It notes that some of your communications were also water marked *"Selina Bright Cosmetic teeth whitening Aesthetics"*. You stated you were acting as an influencer and if you had been approached by the public you would have referred these to your trainer *"Maria"* or to an independent dentist. However, the Committee notes that none of your posts state that you were influencing on behalf of the cosmetic

	company, nor do they explain that anyone called “<i>Maria</i>” would be involved. In addition, your posts do not direct the public to an independent dentist. They only direct the reader to either you or the salon. The Committee is therefore satisfied that you represented to the public and/or allowed a representation to be made to the public, that you were allowed to treat patients with tooth whitening. The head of charge is therefore found proved.
2.b	<i>had discussed this with the General Dental Council.</i> Proved. Witness 2 had stated in oral evidence that she had discussed whether you were allowed to provide tooth whitening treatment. She provided screenshots of a Facebook exchange between you both which contained the relevant GDC regulations explaining that tooth whitening can only lawfully and safely be provided by registered dentists or certain dental care professionals working to a prescription. In response to Witness 2’s concerns you stated, “<i>Thank you for taking your time out to screen shot the GDC regulations which I am not breaking as I have spoken to them personally.</i>” The Committee accepts the evidence of Witness 2 and that an exchange on Facebook took place where you informed her that you were not breaking any regulations and you had spoken to the GDC. The Committee notes that your oral evidence contradicts Witness 2’s evidence. You stated that the telephone call you said you made was regarding your intention to change your career, voluntary removal from the Register and your CPD. Again, Mr Smarts evidence makes it clear that a GDC registered dental nurse is not authorised to carry out this procedure. It was clear from the screenshots provided that you did make the statements alleged in this head of charge. The Committee accepted the evidence of Witness 2. Therefore, the Committee was satisfied that you had represented to the public and/or allowed a representation to be made to the public, that you had discussed this with the GDC. It therefore finds this head of charge proved.
3.	<i>You represented to the public that you were no longer registered with the General Dental Council</i> Proved. The Committee had sight of the Facebook exchange between Witness 2 and yourself, where you state “<i>I can operate and distribute cosmetic teeth whitening without GDC registration. This has been discussed and confirmed before I decided to come off the register</i>”. In another exchange with Witness 2 you stated “<i>I am no longer registered with the GDC after speaking to them myself and being on the register for many years I no longer wanted to be a dental nurse.</i>” The Committee noted the written and oral evidence of Witness 4, a GDC Operations Officer, who confirmed your registration status at that time and the voluntary removal process.

	You stated in oral and written evidence that you genuinely believed you were no longer on the GDC Register following on from a 6 minute telephone call with an employee at the GDC where they stated that you were not registered with the GDC. The Committee is satisfied from the correspondence provided that you were in fact on the GDC register at the time you claimed you were no longer registered. Accordingly, it finds this head of charge proved.
4.	<i>You have caused and/or permitted the advertising of tooth whitening services which were to be delivered by you, and were beyond your scope of practice.</i> Proved. Mr Smart states in his report that “...<i>The GDCs scope of practice document makes is very clear what the limitations are on the practice for a dental nurse. Dental nurses can make bleaching trays for patients, but this must be under the prescription of a dentist. They may not provide the tooth whitening gels as this must be done by a dentist, or by a therapist or hygienist working under the prescription of a dentist. This is to ensure patient safety. As the rules are very clear, and the GDC make is clear within the document Standards for the Dental Team registrants are expected to know all rules applicable to them, were a committee find this charge found proven, this would be a falling of far below standards expected. As I have detailed above – the GDCs scope of practice document makes is clear what can and cannot be done by various members of the dental team.</i>” For similar reasons given in head of charge 2a, the Committee found that it was clear from the evidence provided that you caused and/or permitted the advertising of tooth whitening services which were to be delivered by you. You stated you had no intention to provide tooth whitening services. You were advertising/influencing on behalf of the tooth whitening company and that you would refer any clients to your trainer or an appropriately qualified dental professional. However, there is no evidence that you had stated this in your advertising. Your advertising and communications were of you, as a dental nurse, offering tooth whitening services. The Committee accepts the evidence of Mr Smart and is satisfied that you acted outside your scope of practice. The Committee considers the GDC Standards are every clear as to the boundaries and roles a dental nurse can and can’t do. In addition, the Committee had sight of a number of screenshots of you offering tooth whitening services. In particular the Committee had sight of a screenshot of one of your advertising posts where you state “<i>Hello my lovelys I have been a Registered Orthodontic Nurse for many years travelling around UK & Europe I have met so many lovely patients along the way, With many discussions I have now moved to the Aesthetic side we’re[sic] I will be now offering cosmetic Teeth Whitening & further more medical grade treatments I’d be so grateful if you can support my new business page I will be taking bookings as off October in our family salon... I look forward to seeing you all have a ‘Bright Smile’.</i>” Accordingly, it finds this head of charge proved.

5.	<i>Your actions in relation to allegations 1, and/or 2 and/or 3 were;</i>
5.a	<i>Misleading and/or;</i> Proved for head of charge 1, 2a, 2b and 3. It was accepted by the GDC that you are of previous good character and you provided testimonials in relation to your character. The GDC's case is that your conduct was misleading and two members of the public were actually misled. When this Committee uses the word misleading, it intends to convey that your actions caused members of the public to understand something which was not true. The word misleading does not require an intention to mislead. You stated that social media can be misleading, and you yourself have been a victim of being scammed on social media. You told the Committee that you never intended to mislead either the public or the GDC by advertising yourself as an orthodontic dental nurse. You regret what you advertised and at the time you were just proud of your past achievements of working in orthodontics. You now recognise that this title does not exist with the GDC and acknowledge that your conduct in this respect could be regarded as misleading. In respect of head of charge 2 and 3, you stated that you never intended to mislead or deceive either the GDC or the public. You maintained that you were informed by a GDC employee that you were no longer registered at the time and that you did not set out to provide tooth whitening. You stated that you are fully aware of your scope of practice and recognise your role as a dental nurse. All you want to do is get your dental career back to hopefully become a dental hygienist. In respect of head of charge 1, the Committee noted the oral evidence of Mr Smart that within your email to the GDC dated 18 November 2024, you stated you had undergone inhouse training in orthodontics and implants. If these qualifications/CPD in Mr Smarts opinion were held, the use of the term "qualified orthodontic nurse" is no more than clumsy use of titles on social media and would be a falling below standards. The Committee notes that you have admitted this head of charge and acknowledge that your conduct could be considered as misleading by others. The Committee is satisfied that by using this elevated title this was misleading to members of the public. You have falsely represented a non-authorized GDC dental title. It therefore finds your action in this respect was misleading. In respect of head of charge 2a, the Committee has found proved you made representations to the public that you can deliver tooth whitening services. You made a number of social media adverts and made a number of communications to Witness 2 to confirm this. You accepted this was a misuse of words and could be perceived as being misleading. The Committee is satisfied that you allowed members of the public to believe you could provide tooth whitening services to the public. You could not. It therefore finds your action in this respect was misleading. The Committee considers in respect of head of charge 2b, you stated you had notified Witness 2 that you had not broken any GDC regulations as you had previously spoken to the GDC, who had discussed and confirmed that you could deliver tooth whitening services. There is no objective evidence to support that you had discussed this with the GDC. It therefore finds that by representing to the public that the GDC had

	specifically told you that you could deliver cosmetic tooth whitening services, your actions in this respect were misleading. In respect of head of charge 3, the Committee noted that on 8 October 2024, the GDC confirmed in writing you that your voluntary removal request could not be processed as you were non-compliant with the CPD process. On 14 October 2024, you told Witness 2 that you were no longer registered with the GDC. By this date, you knew that you were still registered with the GDC and that your application had not been processed. The Committee is satisfied that your action by informing a member of the public that you were no longer registered was misleading. On 5 November 2024, the GDC notified you that your voluntary removal would not take effect until December 2024, and on 5 December 2024 you were told that your name was being retained on the Register because of an active Fitness to Practise matter. The Committee is satisfied that your action in your communications was misleading. The Committee therefore finds this head of charge proved in respect of heads of charge 1, 2 and 3.
5.b	<i>Dishonest</i> Proved in respect of 2a, 2b and 3. When considering this charge, the Committee referred to the test set out in the case of <i>Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd. t/a Crockfords</i> [2017] UKSC 67. It first considered the actual state of your knowledge or belief as to the facts at the time. The Committee then considered whether your conduct would be viewed as dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary and decent people. The Committee had concerns regarding the consistency and plausibility of your oral evidence in comparison to your written responses to the GDC, the evidence of your advertisements and the communications both from yourself and your brother to Witness 2. In your written evidence you confirm you paid £2,000 for training and were told by the training company that you were allowed to provide teeth whitening following this training. Your brother wrote to the GDC and confirmed you were providing tooth whitening services at the salon and were fully insured. The Committee noted in your Rule 4 response dated 27/5/25 you told the GDC “<i>The salon was to do beauty and undergone a teeth whitening course</i>”. In oral evidence you told the Committee that you were never going to do tooth whitening and you were merely influencing on behalf of the tooth whitening company. You repeatedly told the panel you were only advertising their services and that you would refer any enquiries onto either a dentist or your “trainer”. The Committee considered that you were evasive during the cross examination by Miss Johnson and when directly challenged regarding your adverts offering tooth whitening you denied you were ever going to provide those services. The Committee found that this change in explanation not plausible. The Committee noted your reliance on a telephone call with the GDC regarding your registration status however the GDC produced cogent evidence through their CRM and phone log records which did not show this call.

Overall, the Committee found your oral testimony to be muddled and confused, and at times contradictory. The Committee places greater weight on the objective evidence in front of it.

You stated that you never set out to deceive any members of the public and you were a victim of the tooth whitening company. You stated you have been registered since 2017, and you are fully aware of your responsibilities as a dental nurse. You recognised that your advertising was wrong. You told the Committee that you have never been dishonest.

In respect of head of charge 1, Mr Smart's evidence is that if the Committee is satisfied that some in house orthodontic training had been undertaken by you, then it could be constituted as a clumsy use of a title, and also if the Committee considers that you were entitled to use that description of your experience, then this would be a falling below the standards expected. The Committee accepts Mr Smart's evidence and considers you thought you were entitled to use this dental title having undergone in house training. It notes you had undergone some in house training and it is satisfied that objectively a member of the public having applied the relevant Ivey test would consider that you did not set out to deliberately deceive the public by using this title. It therefore finds your conduct in this respect was not dishonest.

In respect of head of charge 2a, the Committee first considered your actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts. You stated that you believed that you had been misled by the tooth whitening company; and that you were allowed to provide teeth whitening, because you had received in-house training. You told the Committee that you are an experienced dental nurse and you were aware of your scope of practice as a dental nurse. You also told the Committee you knew you were not allowed to provide tooth whitening services as a dental nurse.

The Committee notes that Witness 2 had sent screenshots to you from the GDC's own website giving clear information that tooth whitening was outside your scope of practice as a dental nurse. However, it notes that you had replied to Witness 2 that you had discussed this with the GDC and you were permitted to provide this treatment.

The Committee considers that your retrospective explanation of events was inconsistent particularly during cross examination. You stated that you were acting as an influencer only and you would never advertise yourself as providing tooth whitening services, yet after you were informed by Witness 2, you continued to advertise tooth whitening. It considers that you as an experienced dental nurse, you would be aware of your scope of practice. In addition, despite having been made aware by Witness 2 that you were not allowed to provide tooth whitening treatment, you continued to advertise yourself as being allowed to provide tooth whitening treatment.

The Committee has applied the test as set out on the case of Ivey v Casinos. It has ascertained subjectively your actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts. It is satisfied that you knew were not allowed to deliver tooth whitening, but nevertheless you represented to the public that you were. Having ascertained your actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts, the Committee next considered whether your actions would be regarded as dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary decent people, and concluded that it would. In reaching this decision, the Committee has not overlooked the fact that you are of previous good character, which is relevant to your credibility and to the issue of propensity. Further, it has considered the possibility of there being an explanation other than dishonesty, such as clumsy use of language,

negligence or poor judgement. The Committee carefully considered all these matters before it arrived at its decision.

In respect of head of charge 2b, the Committee notes the evidence of Witness 2 and the screenshots provided where you state to her *“Thankyou for taking your time out to screen shot the GDC regulations which I am not breaking as I have spoken to them personally.”* You stated that you had a 6 minute call with the GDC. However, the Committee notes that to date no record of this telephone call has been produced. The Committee finds it implausible that a GDC employee would inform you that you are allowed to provide tooth whitening services, given its position on the legality of the provision of such services.

The Committee is satisfied that your knowledge and belief as to the facts at the time was that you knew that you were still on the GDC Register and you had falsely represented to the public that you had discussed this issue with the GDC. The Committee is satisfied the only issues you had discussed with the GDC were your change of career, voluntary removal and CPD requirements.

The Committee has applied the test as set out on the case of *Ivey v Casinos*. It ascertained subjectively your actions, knowledge and belief as to the facts. It is satisfied that you knew you were still on the GDC Register, but nevertheless you represented to the public that you were not. Having ascertained your knowledge and beliefs as to the facts, the Committee next considered whether your actions would be regarded as dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary decent people, and concluded that it would. In reaching this decision, the Committee has not overlooked the fact that you are of previous good character, which is relevant to your credibility and to the issue of propensity. Further, it has considered the possibility of there being an explanation other than dishonesty, such as clumsy use of language, negligence or poor judgement. The Committee carefully considered all these matters before it arrived at its decision.

In respect of charge of charge 3, the Committee noted a number of screen shots on 14 October 2024 of you stating to Witness 2 that you were no longer registered with the GDC. In addition, there is a volume of correspondence between you and the GDC confirming that up until and beyond December 2024 you remained on the Register.

You stated that you got confused with regard to the volume of the GDC communication as to whether you remained on the Register. You stated that on 30 September 2024 you had submitted a form to the GDC stating you wanted to be removed from the Register due to a change of career.

The Committee took into consideration the objective evidence of the communications between yourself and the GDC at this time. It is satisfied that you were clearly informed that you remained on the GDC Register and that you were aware of this. However, you communicated publicly that you were not.

The Committee has applied the test as set out on the case of *Ivey v Casinos*. It has ascertained subjectively your knowledge and belief as to the facts. It is satisfied that you knew that you remained on the GDC Register, but nevertheless you represented to the public that you were not. Having ascertained your actual state of mind, the Committee next considered whether your actions would be regarded as dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary decent people, and concluded that it would. In reaching this decision, the Committee has not overlooked the fact that you are of good

character, which is relevant to your credibility and to the issue of propensity. Further, it has considered the possibility of there being an explanation other than dishonesty, such as clumsy use of language, negligence or poor judgement. The Committee carefully considered all these matters before it arrived at its decision.

It therefore finds this head of charge proved in respect of 2a, 2b and 3.

30. The hearing moves to Stage Two.

Fitness to practise and sanction (Stage 2)

31. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee then moved on to consider whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct and, if so, whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired. In accordance with Rule 20 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2006, the Committee heard submissions from Ms Johnson in relation to the matters of misconduct, impairment and sanction who made reference to relevant case law to support her submissions. It also heard oral submissions from you.

32. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to these matters and bore that advice in mind when coming to its decisions. It also has regard the GDC's document '*Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (January 2026)*'.

Submissions

33. Ms Johnson stated you have no fitness to practice history and informed the Committee that you have been subject to interim conditions of practice order since November 2024. She invited the Committee to find misconduct and that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on the grounds of both public protection and in the public interest. She also stated that the proportionate sanction should be one of suspension for a short period of between 3 and 6 months.

34. Ms Johnson stated that in respect of misconduct, there are four features of the findings which makes your conduct serious. First, this was public facing conduct, your dishonest and misleading representations you made to members of the public through social media and in direct online exchanges. Ms Johnson submitted the public were entitled to rely on what you said about your professional status and about your entitlement to provide tooth whitening, and what you said the GDC had confirmed to you. Secondly, the conduct concerned the boundaries of your scope of practice, as tooth whitening falls within the scope of dentistry and that dental nurses cannot provide tooth whitening treatment. It has been found proved that you caused or permitted the advertising of tooth whitening services which were to be delivered by you and were beyond your scope of practice. Thirdly, your conduct involved misuse or representation of a professional status. You represented yourself as an orthodontic dental nurse, a title that does not exist on the GDC Register, and you also represented publicly that you were no longer registered with the GDC when in fact you were still registered. Finally, and most seriously, you have been found to have acted dishonestly which goes to the heart of public trust.

35. Ms Johnson referred the Committee to the GDC's Standards and identified where, in the GDC's opinion, the principles and standards had been breached by you. Ms Johnson submitted that head of charge 1 may be considered much less serious as opposed to the dishonest findings found in heads of charge 2 and 3. She submitted that these are particularly serious, and taken together with the other facts found proved, are serious breaches which put public safety at risk. In addition, she submitted that these undermines public confidence in the profession. In this regard, she invited the Committee to find such conduct is sufficiently serious as to amount to misconduct.

36. On the matter of impairment, Ms Johnson referred the Committee to the relevant considerations which are: whether the conduct is remediable; whether that conduct has been remedied; and, whether it is highly unlikely to recur. In respect of the Committee's findings relating to misleading the public into believing a dental nurse can deliver tooth whitening treatment, this occurred in a salon and it gives rise to a public protection concern. Ms Johnson submitted that your conduct has brought the profession into disrepute. You breached fundamental tenets of the dental profession, honesty, trustworthiness, accurate advertising and working within your scope of practice, which are all fundamental to safe and ethical practice.

37. Ms Johnson submitted that the question is whether you are currently impaired. The GDC accepts that there are areas of this case that are capable of remediation, such as scope of practice and professional boundaries. Ms Johnson submitted that there has been no repetition and you have fully complied with interim conditions on your registration. You expressed regret and you now understand the importance of working within your scope of practice and the dangers of social media. However, there are remaining concerns, mainly that your insight remains limited. Ms Johnson submitted that throughout your evidence you continued to minimise the seriousness of the conduct by focusing on your assertion that you had not carried out any tooth whitening treatment. You continued to blame the tooth whitening company, witnesses and social media. Your oral testimony was muddled and confused and at times was evasive and contradictory. In addition, there is no evidence of targeted remediation into the matters found proved, including a structured reflective statement. Nor is there any evidence of relevant training undertaken by you on areas such as probity, scope of practice, advertising requirements or ethics. Ms Johnson submitted that in those circumstances there does remain a risk of repetition.

38. Ms Johnson submitted that even where dishonest conduct is capable of remediation, there was no evidence before the Committee that you have demonstrated that you are highly unlikely to act similarly in the future. Therefore, a finding of impairment is required on the grounds of public protection.

39. Ms Johnson submitted that a finding of impairment is also necessary in the wider public interest. She submitted an informed member of the public would be concerned if a dental professional who had dishonestly represented themselves in the manner that has been found proved, were not found to be currently impaired.

40. Ms Johnson therefore invited the Committee to find that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on the grounds of public protection and also in the public interest.

41. On the matter of sanction, Ms Johnson indicated the aggravating and mitigating factors to be considered in this case and invited the Committee to impose a short period of at least 3 months of suspension on your registration, and with a review. She submitted that this is a case where remediation is possible, and in light of all the information before it which includes probity concerns, this is the proportionate and appropriate sanction.

42. You stated that you are not by any means any harm to the public. You stated 19 months ago you removed everything from your social media. You stated you were a victim of a cosmetic company. You will never repeat this type of conduct again. You gave mitigating factors for your behaviour that you were encouraged by the tooth whitening company not to engage with the GDC and to continue with that conduct. You have provided testimonials from colleagues that present you as a respectful and dedicated dental professional. You now recognise the dangers of social media and question what a period of suspension would serve. You stated in the past 19 months you have studied the GDC standards and undertaken some CPD. You stated you have been under interim conditions and have not breached any of the condition, and do not want to lose your dental career.

You stated that you have suffered during the past 19 months and asked the Committee what a further sanction would achieve. In addition, you are sorry for your actions and never meant any harm to members of the public and will never do this again. You stated that to impose a sanction on your registration will restrict your ability to gain employment.

Decision and reasons on misconduct

43. In considering whether the facts found proved amount to misconduct, the Committee had regard to the following principles from the Standards, in particular:

Principle 1 - Put patients' interests first.

Standard 1.3: You must be honest and act with integrity.

Standard 1.3.1 You must justify the trust that patients, the public and your colleagues place in you by always acting honestly and fairly in your dealings with them. This applies to any business or education activities in which you are involved as well as to your professional dealings.

Standard 1.3.2 You must make sure you do not bring the profession into disrepute.

Standard 1.3.3 You must make sure that any advertising, promotional material or other information that you produce is accurate and not misleading and complies with the GDC's guidance on ethical advertising.

Standard 1.9 You must find out about laws and regulations that affect your work and follow them.

Principle 9 - Make sure your personal behaviour maintains patients' confidence in you and the dental profession

Standard 9.1.3 You should not publish anything that could affect patients' and the public's confidence in you, or the dental profession, in any public media, unless this is done as part of raising a concern.

44. Whilst the Committee accepted that not all breaches of the Standards amount to misconduct, it bore in mind the opinion of Mr Smart that if the failings were to be found proved then heads of charge 2, 3 and 4 would fall far below the standards expected. The Committee considers that by representing tooth whitening services which was acting outside of your scope of practise put members of the public at risk of harm. The Committee was satisfied your conduct fell far below the expected standards. In doing so, you have breached fundamental tenets of the profession, particularly honesty. The Committee concluded that fellow practitioners would find your dishonest conduct in making representations of being able to provide tooth whitening services, despite being fully aware that you were not allowed to do so, as deplorable.

45. The Committee is satisfied that the facts found proved are serious and amount to misconduct.

Impairment

46. The Committee considered whether your misconduct is remediable, whether it had been remedied, and the risk of repetition. The Committee also had regard to the wider public interest, which includes the need to uphold and declare proper standards of conduct and behaviour to maintain public confidence in the profession and this regulatory process.

47. In its deliberations it noted the considerations in *CHRE v NMC and Grant* and was satisfied that your conduct had in the past put the public and patients at unwarranted risk of harm, brought the dental profession into disrepute and breached one or more of the fundamental tenets of the profession. Further, you had acted dishonestly. In considering whether your fitness to practise, remained impaired, the Committee considered the 'test' detailed in *Cohen v GMC*.

48. The Committee accepted that the matters in this case are capable of remediation and that whilst dishonesty is more difficult to remediate, it is possible to do so. The Committee noted your submissions that you have taken some steps regarding remediation. It noted you have complied with the interim conditions of your practice. You have engaged with the GDC process and demonstrated some insight and regret for your actions. However, you have not provided any certificates demonstrating participation and completion of relevant CPD or training courses. The Committee noted that your oral and written evidence contained little evidence of targeted remediation and insight and at times was contradictory. In addition, it noted during your oral evidence you sought to place blame on others and failed to provide adequate explanations for your dishonest behaviour. The Committee is not satisfied that you have demonstrated an adequate level of insight and accountability into your past dishonest actions. In addition, it noted that since these events, you have failed to provide evidence of any proper reflection and targeted learning into your failures.

49. Therefore, the Committee determined that you have not demonstrated adequate insight into your misconduct and as a result it was unable to confidently determine that you are highly unlikely to repeat such conduct again in the future.

50. Accordingly, the Committee determined that in the absence of adequate remediation or adequate insight, there remains a risk to public safety were a finding of current impairment is not made in the circumstances. As a result, a finding of impairment is necessary on the ground of public protection.

51. 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 undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in this case where a registrant had dishonestly represented themselves as being allowed to provide tooth whitening services. Therefore, the Committee also found your fitness to practise impaired on the ground of public interest.

Sanction

52. 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 '*Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (January 2026)*'. The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate and appropriate and, although not intended to be punitive, may have that effect.

53. The Committee considered the following aggravating features to be present in this case:

- Dishonesty in the public face;
- Attempt to cover up wrongdoing;
- Abuse of trust/abuse of professional position; and
- Lack of adequate insight.

54. The Committee identified the following mitigating feature to be present:

- No previous regulatory history;
- Confined to a short period of time;
- Health issues during this time;

- No actual treatment provided, therefore no actual harm to patients;
- Admission of head of charge 1;
- Fully engaged with the GDC process; and
- Expression of some remorse.

55. The Committee had regard to its previous findings on misconduct and impairment in coming to its decision and considered each sanction in ascending order of severity.

56. 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 did not consider the conduct to be at the lower end of the spectrum and 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.

57. The Committee next considered whether placing conditions on your registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. It noted that you have been under interim conditions for approximately 20 months and there have been no concerns with your compliance, and there has been no repetition since. However, it was of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated given the nature of the misconduct identified that covers probity and attitudinal concerns. You have not provided adequate insight into the impact your conduct has had on the public. In addition, it did not consider that conditions would adequately address the seriousness of the facts found proved and maintain public confidence in the profession.

58. The Committee then went on to consider whether a suspension would be the appropriate sanction. Suspension may be appropriate when all, or some, of the following factors are present:

- a. ...
- b. *The registrant has not shown insight into the issues which led to a finding of current impairment being made, and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour;*
- c. *A lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest; and,*
- d. *There is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems (which might make erasure the appropriate order).*

59. The Committee after careful consideration, has determined that it would be appropriate and proportionate to suspend your registration. The Committee again notes that you have provided little evidence of adequate insight into, or adequate remediation of, your misconduct. Therefore, the Committee is satisfied that you are at risk of repeating your misconduct. The Committee also considers that the public and the wider public interest would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction.

60. The Committee has made a finding of dishonesty, which was repeated, albeit over a relatively short period of time. It notes that there has been no repetition of this type of conduct whilst you have been subject to interim conditions for approximately 20 months, nor has there been any patient harm. Your conduct relates to a discrete area of tooth whitening practice only. Furthermore, the Committee notes that you have engaged in these proceedings and provided evidence of developing insight, remorse and remediation, in addition there was an admission to one of the heads of charge.

61. The Committee considered the next sanction available to it, which is erasure. It noted that erasure is the most severe sanction that can be imposed. It should be used only when there is no other means of protecting the public and/or maintaining confidence in the profession. It found that to impose the more severe sanction of erasure from the Register would be disproportionate and punitive given all the circumstances. The Committee with an overview of this case concluded that

you do not hold deep seated personal or professional attitudinal issues, and it was satisfied that a suspension would be both proportionate to its findings and sufficient to protect the public and maintain the public interest. It notes you were encouraged by the tooth whitening company not to engage with the GDC and to continue with that conduct, and to your credit you recognised the need to engage with your regulator at that material time. Despite the seriousness of the departure from the expected standards of a registered professional, the Committee was satisfied that the misconduct in this case was not fundamentally incompatible with remaining on the register. Whilst the Committee acknowledges that a suspension may have a punitive effect, it would be unduly punitive to direct erasure at this time.

62. Balancing all these factors, the Committee directs that your registration be suspended for a period of 3 months with a review. This period is necessary and proportionate in order to maintain and uphold public confidence in the profession, whilst sending the public and the profession a clear message about the standards of practice required of a dental nurse. This period is also required for you to focus on the process of remediation.

63. The Committee noted the hardship the suspension may cause you, however this is outweighed by the public interest in this regard.

64. 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.

65. The reviewing PCC may be assisted to receive from you:

- *A wider reflective piece focusing on your dishonesty;*
- *Evidence of targeted CPD;*
- *Evidence of reflection on your CPD;*

66. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether the suspension should take immediate effect to cover the 28-day appeal period.

67. Any interim order on your registration is hereby revoked.

Immediate order and revocation of interim order (Stage 3)

68. The 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. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to this matter.

Submissions

69. In relation to the immediate order, Ms Johnson made an application for an immediate suspension order to be imposed on your registration on both grounds of public protection and in the wider public interest to cover the appeal period.

70. You stated that an immediate order is not necessary.

Decision and reasons on revocation of interim order

71. Following its decision on the substantive order of suspension the Committee was satisfied that it was appropriate to revoke the existing interim order imposed upon your registration with immediate effect.

Decision and reasons on immediate order

72. In relation to the immediate order, the Committee has determined that, given the risks it has identified to the public were you to practise without restriction, an immediate order is necessary on the ground of public protection. Further, an informed member of the public would be concerned if an immediate order was not imposed in the circumstances of this case and therefore an immediate order is also required on the ground of public interest. It would be inconsistent with its earlier findings to permit you to practise before the substantive direction of suspension takes effect and therefore an immediate order is necessary.

73. In all the circumstances, the Committee considered that an immediate order of suspension is consistent with the findings that it has set out in its main determination and is necessary to protect the public and address the public interest concerns identified.

74. The immediate suspension will remain in place until any appeal is disposed of or, if no appeal is lodged, the substantive sanction will replace the immediate suspension order 28 days after you are sent the decision of the Committee in writing.

75. This will be confirmed to you in writing in accordance with the Act.

76. That concludes this determination.