

PUBLIC HEARING
Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing

12 December 2025

Name: TAYLOR, Mollie Hilary

Registration number: 247553

Case reference: CAS-205707-C1S5N6

General Dental Council: Mr David Patience, instructed by Carly Smith, ILPS

Registrant: Not Present and unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Suspension extended (with a review)

Duration: 12 months

Committee members: Carson Black (Dentist) (Chair)
Emma Duke (DCP)
Kam Sandhu (Lay)

Legal adviser: Jane Kilgannon

Committee Secretary: Jamie Barge

1. This was a review hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) in accordance with Section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

2. The Registrant is not present at the hearing nor represented. Mr David Patience, Counsel appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

Purpose of hearing

3. The purpose of this hearing is to carry out a statutory review of an order suspending Miss Taylor's registration. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 36Q of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

Service

4. The Committee first considered whether service has been properly effected in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the 'General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006' ('the Rules') and Section 50A(2) of the Act. The Committee accepted the advice provided by the Legal Adviser.

5. The Committee has received a copy of a notice of hearing (the notice) dated 10 November 2025 which was sent to Miss Taylor's registered address on the same day using the Royal Mail's Special Delivery service. A copy of the notice was also sent to Miss Taylor's known email address. The Committee noted that the screen shot of Miss Taylor's postal and email addresses as registered with the GDC match the address shown on the notice and the email address used by the GDC in emailing the notice to her. The notice sets out the date and time of the hearing, as well as confirming the remote nature of the hearing and the proposal that the review hearing would be taking place orally.

6. The Royal Mail's Track and Trace service, records that the Royal Mail delivered the notice on 12 November 2025. The Committee is mindful that there is no requirement within the Rules for the GDC to prove delivery of the notice, only that it was sent.

7. The Committee was satisfied that the notice dated 10 November 2025 sent to Miss Taylor complied with the 28-day notice period required by the Rules and that it contained all the required particulars. Accordingly, the Committee was satisfied that service was effected in accordance with the Rules and the Act.

Proceeding in absence

8. The Committee then went on to consider whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in the absence of Miss Taylor in accordance with Rule 54. It was mindful that its discretion to proceed in the absence of a registrant must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. The Committee notes that the GDC has invited the Committee to proceed in Miss Taylor's absence. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

9. The Committee considers that the GDC has made all reasonable efforts to inform Miss Taylor of this hearing, both by sending the notice to her registered address and by emailing it to her. Miss Taylor has not responded to the notice dated 10 November 2025, even though she was asked to do so by 28 November 2025.

10. The Committee is aware that as a registered dental professional, Miss Taylor has a duty to co-operate with the GDC in relation to concerns about her fitness to practise. In these circumstances, the Committee has concluded that she has voluntarily absented herself. In the Committee's judgment an adjournment, which has not been sought, would not be likely to secure Miss Taylor's attendance given her last engagement with the GDC was December 2024.

11. The Committee was also mindful of the public interest in the expeditious review of the order in light of its expiry on 7 January 2026. Accordingly, the Committee determined to proceed in the absence of Miss Taylor.

Factual background

12. On 8 December 2021, the GDC received a referral from Witness 1, an ex-work colleague, regarding Miss Taylor and Registrant A. At that time, she was a Practice Manager at {my}dentist ('the Practice').

13. In the referral, Witness 1 (lead dental nurse at the Practice) reported that she had been told that Miss Taylor had falsely edited some Continuing Professional Development (CPD) training certificates for another GDC registered dental nurse, Registrant A. Witness 1 claimed that this editing was undertaken to enable Registrant A to demonstrate compliance with GDC's CPD requirements and had completed sufficient verifiable CPD hours over a two-year period. CPD is a compulsory part of GDC registration and not meeting the minimum CPD requirements can put a registrant's registration at risk. The Committee noted that the GDC's allegation against Miss Taylor at the initial PCC hearing was that she had failed to inform the GDC of Registrant A's fraudulent editing of their CPD certificates, and that her conduct was misleading and dishonest.

14. In December 2024 the PCC considered allegations relating to Miss Taylor's conduct. The PCC found proved by way of admission, that Miss Taylor failed to inform the General Dental Council of Registrant A's fraudulent editing of CPD certificates which were sent to the General Dental Council. It also found proved by way of admission that the conduct was both misleading and dishonest.

15. That PCC determined that the facts found proved amounted to misconduct, and that Miss Taylor's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of that misconduct. In reaching its decision on impairment the PCC noted that Miss Taylor had provided limited evidence of insight into or remediation of her misconduct. It determined that Miss Taylor posed a risk to the public, and further that a finding of impairment was also in the public interest. The PCC determined to suspend Miss Taylor's registration for a period of twelve months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the expiry of the suspension. It also made recommendations to Miss Taylor about the evidence that she might wish to provide to a reviewing Committee.

Current review hearing

16. This Committee has comprehensively reviewed the suspension order. In so doing, it has had regard to the GDC's bundle of documents as well as oral submissions from Mr Patience. It notes from the information before it that Miss Taylor has not engaged with the GDC since the initial hearing in December 2024 and has not provided a detailed reflective statement as recommended by the PCC.

Submissions

17. Mr Patience submits that there has been no material change in circumstances since the last hearing. He submits that Miss Taylor has not engaged in these proceedings or provided any further evidence of remediation or insight. Mr Patience therefore submits that the public and the wider public interest remains at risk if Miss Taylor were to be permitted to practice without restriction.

18. Mr Patience submitted that Miss Taylor's fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct, and that a further period of suspended registration for 12 months would be appropriate with a review.

Committee's determination

19. The Committee has considered carefully all the information presented to it, including the documentation and oral submissions made by Mr Patience. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Current Impairment

20. The Committee is mindful that there is a persuasive burden on the registrant to demonstrate that their fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The Committee notes that there has been no material change of circumstances since the last PCC hearing in December 2024. Miss Taylor has not engaged with these proceedings since December 2024 and has produced no evidence of any insight into or remediation of her misconduct. Nor has she provided a detailed reflective statement as recommended by the previous Committee. The Committee considers that Miss Taylor therefore continues to pose a risk to the public, and that her fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of her misconduct.

21. The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is required to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour, and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process.

Sanction

22. The Committee next considered whether it would be appropriate to terminate the suspension, or to replace the suspension with a direction of conditional registration.

23. The Committee considered that terminating the suspension would not be sufficient to protect the public or meet the public interest considerations referred to above.

24. The Committee next considered whether it could formulate conditions which would be workable and which would address the ongoing risks. There is no evidence before the Committee to suggest that Miss Taylor would comply with conditions, given her non-engagement with the GDC. Accordingly, it concluded that conditions would not be sufficient or workable to meet the public protection and public interest considerations in this case.

25. The Committee then considered whether it would be appropriate to extend the current period of suspension. The Committee concluded that a further period of suspended registration is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose in the particular circumstances of this case. The Committee considers that a further period of 12 months' suspension is required to protect the public and the public interest. It also considers any lesser period of time would serve no useful purpose given Miss Taylor's lack of engagement.

26. The Committee hereby directs that Miss Taylor's registration be suspended for a further period of 12 months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. This direction will take effect from the date on which the existing period of suspension would otherwise expire, namely on 7 January 2026.

27. Although the Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the future reviewing Committee which will review Miss Taylor's suspension in around 12 months' time, it considers that the future reviewing Committee may be assisted by:

- A detailed reflective statement demonstrating your insight into and understanding of the dishonesty and its impact on patients, the dental profession, and public confidence.

28. The above recommendation is the same as that proposed by the PCC in December 2024.

Right of appeal

29. Miss Taylor will have 28 days from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served on her to appeal against this decision. Should she decide to appeal, the existing direction of suspension will remain in force until the resolution of any such appeal. Should she decide not to appeal, the extension of the suspension will take effect on the date on which it would otherwise expire.

30. That concludes this case for today.