

**PARTLY PRIVATE HEARING
Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing**

1-2 October 2026

Name: EMAMI, Nariman
Registration number: 175607
Case number: CAS-206247-C4X7M7

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

Registrant: Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to Practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)
Duration: 6 Months

Committee members: Carson Black (Chair and Dentist Member)
Jane Jones (Lay Member)
Hannah Couch (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal adviser: Peter Jennings

Committee Secretary: Kate Anderson

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

Mr Emami,

1. This is a resumed hearing of your case before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) pursuant to section 27C of the *Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)* ('the Act').
2. You were present at the hearing, but not represented.
3. Ms Peta-Louise Bagott, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC).
4. The hearing was conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams.

Purpose of the hearing

5. The purpose of the hearing has been for the Committee to review a substantive suspension order currently in place on your registration.

Application for the Hearing to take place in Private

6. At the beginning of the hearing, Ms Bagott made an application for the hearing to take place partly in private pursuant to Rule 53(1) and (2) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the Rules). Ms Bagott submitted that you intended to refer to matters concerning your private and family life at this hearing. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.
7. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, having regard to the particular circumstances of your case, the Committee determined that it was necessary that parts of the hearing should be held in private to protect your private and family life. The Committee was satisfied that this outweighed the public interest in open hearings. It therefore acceded to the application.

Case background

Initial hearing: March- April 2025

8. Your case was first considered by the PCC at a hearing held between 31 March – 4 April 2025. You were present at that hearing but you were not represented. The initial PCC considered and found proved the following allegations:
 - You failed to respond adequately to Person A's complaint about Person B's dental treatment.
 - You failed to have appropriate insurance or indemnity in place from 27 January 2019 to 30 April 2019 and from 1 May 2020 until 31 July 2020.
 - You failed to co-operate with an investigation conducted by the GDC from 14 September 2022 until at least 16 May 2023.
 - You failed to maintain an up to date registered address from at least April 2021 until 4 March 2025.

9. The initial PCC determined that your fitness to practise was impaired by reason of your misconduct on both public protection and wider public interest grounds.
10. The initial PCC imposed a suspension order on your registration for a period of 9 months, with an immediate order. It also directed that a review of the order should be conducted shortly before the expiry of the 9-month period.
11. The PCC indicated that it might be helpful for the reviewing Committee to receive the following from you:
 - Evidence of your continued engagement with the GDC and this process, including that you have maintained a current and up to date registered address.
 - If you have continued to practise outside of the UK, and if required, evidence of your professional indemnity/insurance.
 - A written reflective piece in relation to all the issues in this case.
 - Any evidence of relevant courses you have undertaken (e.g. Complaints Handling, Communication Skills, Administrative skills).
 - Testimonials, including from professional colleagues.
12. The PCC also determined at this hearing that an immediate order was required in light of the findings against you.

First resumed hearing – January 2026

13. The suspension order imposed on your registration was reviewed by the PCC at a hearing held on 5 January 2026. You were present at the hearing but not represented.
14. The PCC on this date determined that your fitness to practise remained impaired by reason of your misconduct.
15. The resumed PCC extended the suspension in place on your registration by a period of 9 months. It also directed a further review shortly before the end of the extended period.
16. The PCC included in its determination that the future reviewing Committee may be assisted by the following:
 - Your attendance at the review hearing
 - If you have continued to practise outside of the UK, and if required, evidence of your professional indemnity/insurance.
 - A written reflective piece in relation to all the issues in this case.
 - Any evidence of relevant courses you have undertaken (e.g. Complaints Handling, Communication Skills, Administrative skills).
 - Testimonials, including from professional colleagues.

Today's review

17. This is the second review of the substantive suspension first imposed on your registration in April 2025.

Summary of Submissions

18. Ms Bagott referred the Committee to the background of the case, including the decision made by the initial PCC and subsequent reviewing PCC. She referred the Committee to its powers in reviewing the matters.
19. Ms Bagott submitted that you had been provided with suggestions by both the initial PCC and the subsequent reviewing PCC on what actions you could take to satisfy the PCC that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
20. Ms Bagott submitted that the bundle you provided to the Committee contained some written reflections in which you apologise for your conduct and state that you are now a Dental Practice Principal. You also stated that you have been working with no complaints and you also provided proof of your indemnity.
21. Ms Bagott submitted that the GDC's position is that you remain impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds.
22. On the public protection ground, Ms Bagott submitted that you have made some efforts to improve your insight and remediation since the previous review hearing in January. However, she submitted that your insight remains limited in that you have not addressed the matter of non-cooperation with the GDC. She submitted that there is also no evidence of completed courses in relation to complaints handling or in relation to administration tasks. She also submitted that you have not provided any testimonials from your colleagues. Ms Bagott therefore submitted that there was no evidence of full insight and remediation and that the risk of repetition consequently remains. She submitted that it cannot be accepted that you have shown insight into the gravity of your conduct. She submitted that the position of the GDC is therefore that your fitness to practise remains impaired on public protection grounds.
23. Ms Bagott submitted that a finding of impairment was also necessary to uphold and maintain proper standards. She submitted that it was in the wider public interest and would maintain public confidence in the dental profession.
24. Ms Bagott reminded the Committee that it was not bound by the previous Committee's decision. She submitted that the persuasive burden was on you to prove that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.
25. Ms Bagott next made submissions in relation to sanction. She drew the Committee's attention to its powers, and to the principle of proportionality.
26. Ms Bagott submitted that to allow the order to lapse would be inappropriate given that a public protection and public interest risk remain, and that the risk of repetition continues. She submitted that conditions would be inappropriate in the circumstances as you have not remediated your conduct completely, and further reflection and remediation would be necessary to make any conditions workable.

27. Ms Bagott therefore submitted that the current sanction of suspension should be extended, and that this remains the appropriate and proportionate sanction to address the findings. She submitted that the suspension should be extended to allow you to take further steps towards insight and remediation, and to show that these are embedded into your practice. She submitted that this would ensure that patients' interests were fully protected. She invited the Committee to extend the suspension for a period of 3 months, a shorter period of time as the GDC appreciates that you have begun to take steps towards remediation, but considers that you need more time to fully address these matters. Ms Bagott submitted that a review should be held at the end of this 3-month period.
28. You submitted that it is important to you that the GDC has trust in you again, and explained how important working as a dentist is to you.
29. You submitted that you learnt a lot from the initial PCC. You told the Committee that you have completed online learning. You told the Committee that you have researched many online courses on dealing with patient complaints. You explained to the Committee that you understand now the importance of appropriately dealing with complaints in a timely manner.
30. You informed the Committee that you have been unable to demonstrate improvement in your complaint handling as you have received no patient complaints since working in Germany.
31. You submitted that you have been working as a Dental Practice Principal in Germany since 1 January 2026. Prior to taking up this post, you told the Committee that you needed to undertake a significant number of courses in order to satisfy the authorities that you were competent to work in this position. You hoped that this provided the GDC with evidence that you have improved your administrative ability.
32. You submitted that *'when someone in Germany searches for me online, they see that I am not allowed to work in England, which is bad for me. It is important for me that I have a better image in Germany for my private life'*.
33. The Committee asked you several questions in regard to your submissions. You answered questions relating to testimonials and whether you could provide any as previously suggested by the reviewing PCC, and you submitted that when you change employment you receive a certificate from the employer which explains how you performed. You informed the Committee that you could provide this but that it would need to be translated into English.
34. You also answered questions in relation to the training courses you have undertaken, and whether you completed any further CPD. You informed the Committee that you have completed many courses in German that did not count towards your CPD hours for the year. These included courses on how to handle patients' complaints. You informed the Committee that you undertook online learning that did not count towards CPD and did not provide certificates for this. You told the Committee that you had

identified courses in the UK that you could do to target the issues of concern, but that you have not undertaken these yet.

35. The Committee asked you to expand upon your reflections on your misconduct, as the reflective piece provided focussed on your transition to working in Germany, rather than the concerns identified. You told the Committee that you did not tell the GDC about your change of address as you thought they would know automatically that you had moved. You also stated that you know now that your organisational skills were poor.

36. Lastly you answered questions on why you have not yet reached a point where you are able to provide evidence in line with the recommendations from the two previous Committees despite 18 months having passed since you were originally suspended. You told the Committee that you have been focussed on the transition to working and living in Germany and on difficulties in your private life. **[PRIVATE]**.

37. You submitted that an extension of the suspension for three to six months would allow you time to complete the necessary steps to satisfy the Committee that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

Committee's Decision

38. In comprehensively reviewing the order today, the Committee considered the submissions made by Ms Bagott and by you, and all of the documentary evidence provided. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to its powers and the principles which should guide its approach. The Committee took into account the GDC's *"Fitness to Practice: Guidance for the practice committees"* (January 2026).

Decision on current impairment

39. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct. In doing so, it exercised its independent judgement. It had regard to the over-arching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession.
40. The Committee first considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired on the public protection ground. The Committee considered that your conduct is remediable. However, it has only had sight of limited evidence that you have remedied the issues identified by the initial PCC 18 months ago and the subsequent reviewing Committee 9 months ago. The Committee noted your submissions that you have undertaken some training in Germany, but you did not provide any certification or evidence of this. The Committee further considered that you have not provided evidence that you have undertaken any further CPD training nor completed subsequent reflections. It noted that your explanation for this was very similar to the one you provided to the previous reviewing Committee, 9 months ago.

41. The Committee also considered that you have not provided any testimonials from colleagues that address your practice in relation to the issues. The Committee also considered that your reflective statement did not address all of the issues identified. The Committee acknowledged that you have been experiencing ongoing difficulties in your personal life since the period of suspension was imposed, but was not satisfied that this made a material difference to your need to take steps to remediate and develop insight.
42. The Committee therefore determined that you have provided insufficient material to satisfy it that you have sufficient insight and that you have fully remedied your conduct. Given the limited evidence of insight and remediation, the Committee could not safely conclude that the risk of repetition is so low that no finding of impairment needs to be made on public protection grounds. The Committee therefore determined that your fitness to practise remains impaired on this ground.
43. The Committee also determined that a finding of impairment continues to be required in the wider public interest. It considered that public confidence in the dental profession would be undermined if such a finding were not made given the ongoing concerns in this case, because of your limited insight and remediation to date. The Committee also considered that a finding of impairment would serve to uphold proper professional standards and maintain public confidence in the dental profession.
44. Accordingly, the Committee determined that your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your misconduct.

Decision on sanction

45. The Committee next considered what action to take in respect of your registration. It had regard to section 27(C)(1) of the Act, which sets out the options available to it at this review. The Committee also took into account the GDC's *"Fitness to Practice: Guidance for the practice committees"* (January 2026). It noted that the purpose of any sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have that effect, but to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests.
46. The Committee considered that a restriction on your registration remains necessary, given its finding that your fitness to practise remains impaired on both public protection and public interest grounds. It determined that to allow the order to lapse would be inappropriate.
47. The Committee also decided that it would be inappropriate to terminate the current suspension and impose conditions of practice. It considered that conditions could not be formulated that would adequately address the issues as they are attitudinal and not clinical in nature. The Committee was also of the view that conditions would be unworkable as you are currently working in Germany. The Committee considered that conditions would neither be appropriate or proportionate to address the issues, as you have not provided sufficient evidence of targeted remediation, nor have you demonstrated more than partial insight into your conduct.

48. The Committee therefore determined that a sanction of suspension remained the appropriate and proportionate sanction on your registration. The Committee considered that a demonstration of genuine insight and evidence of targeted remediation is required in order for you to satisfy the Committee that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The Committee considered that extending the suspension would allow you the opportunity to develop full insight and undertake targeted remediation.
49. The Committee determined that the suspension should be extended for a further 6-month period. The Committee's view was that an extension of the suspension for a further 6 months was appropriate and proportionate. This period would provide you with enough time to develop your insight and to complete the steps towards remediation.
50. A resumed hearing will be held shortly before the end of the 6-month period at which the suspension will be reviewed. You will be informed of the date and time of that resumed hearing.
51. The Committee suggested that a future Committee could be assisted by the following suggested actions:
- Your attendance at the review hearing;
 - If you have continued to practise outside of the UK, and if required, evidence of your professional indemnity/insurance;
 - A written reflective statement that highlights your understanding of why your failure to respond to patients' complaints, failure to have appropriate indemnity, and failure to engage fully and cooperate with the GDC investigation were wrong. It should also address the impact that this conduct could have on patients and the reputation of the dental profession;
 - Documentary evidence of the completion of courses of any type that address the issues listed above. You should also provide your reflections of what you have learnt and put into practice following these courses;
 - Testimonials - signed and dated written letters from colleagues who are aware of the reasons behind your impairment and who speak of how you have developed since this finding;
 - Any further evidence that will help the Committee in reviewing its decision.
52. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the current suspension on your registration will be extended for a period of 6 months, beginning with the date that it would otherwise expire.
53. You will have 28 days from the date that notice is deemed to have been served upon you to appeal this decision. In the event that you do exercise your right of appeal, the direction for suspension currently in place on your registration will remain in force until the resolution of the appeal.
54. The Committee's decision will be confirmed to you in writing in accordance with the Act.

55. That concludes this determination.

PUBLIC