Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing

22 October 2026

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

General Dental Council:	Tom Stevens, Counsel Instructed by Melanie Spencer, IHLPS
Registrant:	Present Unrepresented

Fitness to practise:	Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome:	Suspension extended (with a review)
Duration:	Two months

Committee members:	Marnie Hayward	(Chair, Dental Care Professional member)
	Aleena Choudhry	(Lay member)
	Melissa Oura	(Dentist member)
Legal adviser:	Graeme Dalgleish	
Committee Secretary:	Sara Page	

Ms Bright,

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee pursuant to section 36Q of the '*Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)'* ('the Act'). Members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, are participating via Microsoft Teams in line with the General Dental Council's (GDC) current practice of holding hearings remotely.

2. You were present at the hearing and not legally represented. You were accompanied by a family member who was in attendance to provide support during the hearing.

3. Mr Tom Stevens, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

Background

4. This hearing was convened to review the current suspension order, which is due to expire on 27 November 2026.

5. This is the first review of a substantive suspension order initially imposed by the Professional Conduct Committee ('the PCC') on 31 July 2026. The charges, found proved, related to you advertising tooth whitening services which were outside of your scope of practice and dishonesty relating to your registration and ability to undertake tooth whitening services.

6. At the initial substantive hearing, the PCC found your fitness to practise impaired by reason of misconduct. The PCC's findings on misconduct are as follows:

> *'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.'*

7. The PCC stated the following regarding its findings on impairment:

> *'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.'*

8. The PCC directed that your registration be subject to a suspension order for a period of three months, with a review, stating:

> *'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.*
>
> *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 whist 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.*
> *…*
>
> *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.*
> *…*
>
> *The reviewing PCC may be assisted to receive from you:*
>
> - *A wider reflective piece focusing on your dishonesty;*
> - *Evidence of targeted* [Continuing Professional Development] *CPD;*
> - *Evidence of reflection on your CPD…'*

Decision and reason for the hearing to be held partly in private

9. The Committee made a decision pursuant to Rule 53 of the *'General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006'* ('the Rules') to hear references to your private and family life in private.

10. Mr Stevens raised no objection to this proposed course of action.

11. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, having regard to the information before it, which relates to your private and family life, the Committee was satisfied that your personal interests outweighed the public interest in this case.

12. The Committee was satisfied that the hearing should be held in private when discussing matters relating to your private and family life are being discussed.

Submissions

13. Mr Stevens, on behalf of the GDC, submitted that, having considered the information you have provided to date, that further insight and remediation is required in this case. He therefore invited the Committee to find that your fitness to practise remains impaired and to extend the current suspension order for a further period of three to six months. Mr Stevens reminded the Committee that it is not bound by the previous determination but referred to the rationale underpinning the previous findings and the recommendations of the PCC in reviewing this matter. He invited the Committee to consider whether you have effectively addressed the concerns detailed by the PCC, specifically the dishonesty, by providing evidence of adequate insight alongside tailored and targeted CPD with appropriate reflections.

14. You provided oral evidence under affirmation. You stated that these proceedings have been deeply difficult for you and your family and reminded the Committee that you have attended each and every hearing, obtaining free legal advice to support your case. You made reference to personal information in order to provide some background and context to this case.

15. You disputed the way you have been referred to as dishonest throughout these proceedings. You told the Committee about your concerns relating to the evidence relied upon by the GDC at the PCC hearing. You stated that you have obeyed every instruction the GDC has required of you as you are a law-abiding citizen who was fooled by the tooth whitening training company, and likened yourself to a victim of fraud. You told the Committee that you never performed tooth whitening services and had no intention of doing so, that you were advertising on behalf of the training company, similar to online influencing. You stated that you had protected the public 20 months ago when you immediately took down the advertising on your social media accounts.

16. You said that you have recognised the damage that has been caused over the last 20 months and provided written reflections and evidence to demonstrate this. You also provided your CPD certificate demonstrating that you have undertaken 10 hours 15 minutes of training covering the period between 1 August 2026 and 31 July 2027, taking the Committee through the individual training courses you have undertaken.

17. You referred to positive character references provided on your behalf, from whom you described as celebrity and highly respected professionals, all attesting to your good character and were dismayed to still hear that the GDC does not consider this to prove that your fitness to practise is no longer impaired.

18. You also told the Committee that you have met up with dental peers who have given you advice and supported you throughout these proceedings. You explained how you have looked at the scope of practice for dental nurses and other documentation including audits, risk assessment, and law and ethics in dentistry.

19. You told the Committee that you would never do anything like this again and would never undertake a training course without the recommendation of a dental professional in the future. You stated that you are a good person to have on the Register and that you strive to protect the public by continuing your learning and reflection, assuring the Committee that you would never do anything like this again and wish to return to the career that you love.

20. In light of your learning and reflection, you submitted that a further period of suspension would serve no purpose.

Decision and reasons on current impairment

21. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise remains impaired. In reaching its decision on the issue of impairment, the Committee exercised its own independent judgement. It bore in mind that its duty is to consider the public interest, which includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.

22. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who reminded the Committee that it could not change the factual findings of the PCC including the findings of dishonesty, but must a make fresh assessment of fitness to practise and any risk posed to the public and/or the wider public interest as of today's date.

23. In coming to its decision, the Committee had regard to whether your misconduct has been remedied and whether it is likely to be repeated.

24. In assessing whether you are liable in the future to act in a way that puts patients at unwarranted risk of harm, the Committee considered that you have demonstrated considerable remorse for your actions and had informed the Committee of the impact these proceedings have had on yourself and your family.

25. In considering the documentation you have provided today, the Committee was not satisfied that the reflective statement was sufficient to demonstrate a clear understanding and recognition of the PCC's findings, any review of your own professional behaviour or how you would act differently, or fully reflected on the magnitude and the consequences of the dishonest conduct found proved. You also did not demonstrate any understanding of how the dishonest conduct, found proved, may have undermined public confidence in you as a practitioner or in the wider dental profession. In addition, no individual CPD certificates or associated reflections have been submitted by you. The majority of completed CPD that you referred to in the hearing was of a general nature, rather than targeted specifically to address the dishonesty findings highlighted in the PCC.

26. The Committee noted that you did not accept the findings of the PCC and whilst you are entitled to maintain your denials of the conduct found proved, it did not appear to the Committee that you understand the details or the seriousness of the findings of dishonesty made against you. The Committee took into account that you have persistently denied undertaking any tooth whitening services, but noted that this was not one of the allegations before the PCC.

27. The Committee noted that this has been a very difficult experience for you and it acknowledged that you made assurances that you would not act in the same way again, but it was unclear from your evidence that you understand what your misconduct was in this case (as referred to at paragraph 6, above).

28. Therefore, without you having demonstrated a full and comprehensive understanding and reflection on the PCC's findings on dishonesty, the Committee concluded that there was a risk of repetition in the future.

29. Accordingly, the Committee determined that you have not demonstrated sufficient insight or remediation and as a result, your fitness to practise remains impaired on the grounds of both public protection and public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction

30. The Committee had regard to the GDC document, *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (6 January 2026)'.* The Committee considered what, if any, sanction to impose in

this case. The Committee was aware of the range of sanctions available to it and that it must consider the sanctions in order from the least serious.

31. The Committee was aware that it should have regard to the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest against your own interests. The public interest includes the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding standards of conduct and performance within the profession.

32. The Committee first considered the imposition of conditions of practice but in light of its findings on current impairment, it determined that conditions were not workable or appropriate as you have not demonstrated a full understanding of the findings made against you. There are no conditions that could be formulated that would allow you to return to practise given your lack of insight and insufficient remediative steps.

33. The Committee therefore determined that the current period of suspension should be extended by a further period of two months beginning with the date on which the present order would otherwise expire, with a review. It was satisfied that this would provide you with an opportunity to continue to develop your insight and provide evidence that you fully understand the PCC's findings against you. It would also provide you with an opportunity to demonstrate any learning you have been able to achieve to reduce the likelihood of repetition of such conduct in the future.

34. The Committee concluded that a further period of two months should provide you with sufficient time to be able to address the concerns outlined in this determination.

35. For clarity, the reviewing PCC may be assisted by:

- Comprehensive written reflection on the impact of the PCC's findings of dishonesty on patients and the wider public, including reference to public confidence and maintenance of proper standards, using a recognised framework such as the *'Gibb's Reflective Cycle';*
- Completion of a Personal Development Plan focused on how you intend to avoid any repetition of the PCC's findings on dishonesty; and,
- Evidence of relevant and specific CPD, related to the PCC's findings on dishonesty.

36. The suspension order will be reviewed before its expiry. At the review hearing, the Committee may revoke the order, it may confirm the order, or it may replace the order with another order.

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

38. That concludes this hearing.