

PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

22 to 24 September 2025

Name: GRZELCZAK, Hanna Izabela

Registration number: 175203

Case number: CAS-209290

General Dental Council: Natalie Bird, counsel
Instructed by Holly Watt, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Represented by Stephen Brassington, counsel
Instructed by Sara Foster, MDDUS

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct

Outcome: Erased with Immediate Suspension¹

Duration: N/A

Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Matthew King (Dentist) (Chair)
John Marley (Lay)
Rachel McCoubrey (Dental Care Professional)

Legal adviser: Melanie Swinnerton

Committee Secretary: Gareth Llewellyn

¹ On 24 September 2025, the Professional Conduct Committee made an order to erase Ms Grzelczak from the register and ordered that their registration be suspended immediately. On 16 October 2025, Ms Grzelczak lodged an appeal at the High Court. On 17 April 2026, the High Court allowed the appeal and ordered that the sanction of erasure be set aside and be substituted with a suspension for a period of six months (with review). Per the High Court's direction, the suspension will be reviewed prior to its scheduled expiry date.

Determination on preliminary matters – 22 September 2025

Name: GRZELCZAK, Hanna Izabela

Registration number: 175203

Ms Grzelczak

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being held remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice.
2. You are present and are represented by Stephen Brassington of counsel, instructed by Sara Foster of the Medical and Dental Defence Union of Scotland (MDDUS). Natalie Bird of counsel, instructed by Holly Watt of the General Dental Council's (GDC's) In-House Legal Presentation Service (IHLPS), appears for the GDC.

The charge

3. The charge that you face at this hearing is set out as follows:

That, being registered as a dentist:

1. You made comments within emails to colleagues or former colleagues at [redacted] including:
 - a) On 25 August 2023 you sent Person A an email in which you stated: *"I don't want to be connected to Indian dentistry"*.
 - b) On 26 August 2023 you sent Person A an email in which you stated: *"I am not Indian I provide German quality. It is a huge difference"*.
 - c) On 21 September 2023 you sent Person A an email in which you stated: *"I noticed my name Hann Grzelczak dentist In Google is connected with [redacted] practices. I feel low with this connection as [redacted] is nhs low quality service and this is indian company! It is a shame to me"*.
 - d) On 22 September 2023 you sent Person B an email in which you stated: *"Please remember I don't provide Indian implants. I provide German technology"*.
2. *Your communications as set out in Charge 1a. and/or, 1b. and/or 1c. and/or, 1d. were:*
 - a) *Unprofessional; and/or*
 - b) *Inappropriate; and/or*
 - c) *Racially motivated.*

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

Background to the case and summary of allegations

4. The allegations giving rise to this hearing arise out of emails that you are alleged to have sent to colleagues in August and September 2023. In those emails you are alleged to have made comments to two colleagues who were also employed by the employer for whom you worked. The two colleagues in question are not GDC registrants. The GDC contends that the comments that you are alleged to have made were unprofessional, inappropriate and racially motivated. As set out below, you admit each of these allegations.

Evidence

5. The Committee was provided with documentary material in advance of the hearing in relation to the heads of charge that you face, including the witness statement and documentary exhibits of Person A, who is a data manager with your former employer; those of Person C, who is the director of compliance with your former employer; and those provided by you.
6. The Committee heard no oral evidence at this stage of the hearing.

Admissions

7. At the preliminary stage of the hearing on the morning of 22 September 2025, Mr Brassington on your behalf tendered admissions to all of the heads of charge that you face. These heads of charge are, namely, heads of charge 1 (a), 1 (b), 1 (c), 1 (d), 2 (a), 2 (b) and 2 (c). The Committee, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, determined and announced that the facts alleged at all the heads of charge were proven on the basis of your admissions in accordance with Rule 17 (4) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules').

Adjournment

8. The hearing adjourned on 22 September 2025 following the Committee's determination on the admissions that you made as set out above, and following Ms Bird providing an outline of the case. The hearing adjourned until 23 September 2025, with the second stage of the hearing to commence on that date.

Determination on misconduct, impairment and sanction – 24 September 2025

9. Following the handing down of the Committee's determination on preliminary matters, the hearing proceeded to stage two; that is to say, misconduct, impairment and sanction.

Proceedings at stage two

10. The Committee has considered all the evidence presented to it, both oral and documentary. It has taken into account the submissions made by Ms Bird on behalf of the GDC, and those made by Mr Brassington on your behalf. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to, and did not depart from, 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 concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

Evidence at stage two

11. The Committee had regard to the reflective statement dated 22 September 2025 that you prepared for this second stage of the hearing, as well as documents relating to your engagement with a practitioner advice and support scheme ('PASS') run by your local dental committee. The Committee was also provided with documentation relating to your fitness to practise history with the GDC. In addition, the Committee had regard to the witness statement dated 23 July 2025 that you provided in advance of the hearing.
12. The Committee heard oral evidence from you at this stage of the hearing.

Summary of submissions

13. Ms Bird on behalf of the GDC invited the Committee to find that the proven facts amount to misconduct. Ms Bird submitted that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of

your misconduct, and that the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose is one of erasure from the register.

14. Mr Brassington on your behalf submitted that you readily accept that the proven facts amount to misconduct, and that you do not seek to argue that your fitness to practise is not currently impaired with regard to public interest considerations. Mr Brassington submitted however that there is no real prospect of you repeating your misconduct. Mr Brassington contended that the sanction sought by the GDC of erasure would be disproportionate, and that a direction of suspension would be the appropriate sanction.

Fitness to practise history

15. Ms Bird took the Committee's attention to your fitness to practise history with the GDC in accordance with Rule 20 (1) (a) of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules').
16. In September 2023 the PCC issued a reprimand following its finding of impairment by reason of misconduct. The facts giving rise to the finding of misconduct related to you posting comments on the Facebook social networking site about a patient in November 2020 which were judged to be unprofessional and which amounted to a breach of the patient's confidentiality. Ms Bird also drew the Committee's attention to the decision of the GDC's Case Examiners (CEs) to issue advice to you in May 2023 about communicating with staff in a professional manner following a referral in respect of responding to a patient complaint.

Misconduct

17. The Committee first considered whether the facts that it has found proved constitute misconduct. In considering this and all other matters, the Committee has exercised its own independent judgement.
18. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the following paragraphs of the GDC's *Standards for the Dental Team* (September 2013) in place at the time of the incidents giving rise to the facts that the Committee has found proved. These paragraphs state that as a dentist you must:
 - 1.3.2 *Make sure you do not bring the profession into disrepute.*
 - 6 *Work with colleagues in a way that is in patients' best interest*
 - 6.1.2 *Treat colleagues fairly and with respect, in all situations and all forms of interaction and communication. You must not bully, harass, or unfairly discriminate against them.*
 - 9.1 *Ensure that your conduct, both at work and in your personal life, justifies patients' trust in you and the public's trust in the dental profession.*
 - 9.1.1 *Treat all team members, other colleagues and members of the public fairly, with dignity and in line with the law.*
19. The Committee's findings of fact relate to four emails that you sent to former colleagues in August and September 2023. The Committee found that the content of those four emails was unprofessional, inappropriate and racially motivated.
20. In light of the findings of fact that it has made, the Committee has little difficulty in determining that the proven facts amount to misconduct. Your misconduct was sustained and repeated across four emails sent over a period of approximately four weeks. Each of these separate emails was unprofessional, inappropriate and, most seriously, racially motivated. The Committee considers that your conduct was a serious falling short of, and a particularly

egregious departure from, the standards reasonably to be expected of a registered dentist. In the Committee's judgement your conduct would be viewed as deplorable by your fellow practitioners. Your conduct was a breach of a fundamental tenet of the profession, namely the need to treat others with respect and not bring the profession into disrepute.

21. The Committee has therefore determined that the facts that it has found proved amount to misconduct.

Impairment

22. The Committee next considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of the misconduct that it has found. In doing so, the Committee again exercised its own independent judgement.
23. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has borne in mind that its overarching objective is to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
24. The Committee has carefully considered whether you have demonstrated insight into your misconduct, and if so the extent to which you have done so, and whether you have taken adequate and appropriate steps to address and remedy your failings. In so doing it has had particular regard to the evidence that you have provided.
25. In your reflective statement dated 22 September 2025 you apologised for your conduct, stating that you have learned from the experience and that you are '*committed to approaching similar situations with more care and professionalism in the future*'. You referred to external challenges and pressures prevailing at the relevant times, meaning that you '*lost sight of the need to maintain professionalism and respect towards dental professionals*'. You stated that you '*used irrational, racist words to express my frustration and reach my objectives. I recognise now that this behaviour is completely unacceptable and inappropriate.*' You also referred to your shame in having sent the emails in question. You stated that you lacked professional support and guidance at what was a challenging time, and that you have since made improvements in the relevant aspects of your practice through the PASS scheme run by your local dental committee as referred to above. You stated in conclusion that you have '*shifted [your] perspective*', that you are now more resilient, that you have a deep respect for those of Indian nationality and that you are '*committed to fostering positive relationships*'. You denied being a racist and stated that the emails do not reflect your personally held beliefs.
26. In the documents relating to your engagement with the PASS scheme you recorded on 25 June 2024 that you had '*made significant progress in understanding professional ethics. I studied all the important aspects and completed all planned CPD activities. I reflected on this and made improvements in my clinical routine*'. Your mentor recorded on 15 December 2024 that you had undertaken CPD on legal and ethical practice and that you were '*keen to maintain and further develop appropriate personal and professional behaviour. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) has been an especially important part of her developmental journey. She has provided some reflective summary to demonstrate her understanding of the topics but she intends to future proof this element of her professional development*'. Some comments were added in relation to you struggling with your reflections and insight, as well there being further improvements to be made in relation to your verbal and non-verbal communication.
27. In your oral evidence to the Committee you described that your thinking was clouded at the relevant times, including by the PCC proceedings referred to above, and that you now recognise that your comments about the chief executive officer (CEO) of your employer were inappropriate. You stated that the racially motivated comments that you made were the first

things that came to your mind when you were in that state. You described being ‘switched off’ and that you did not realise you were making racially-motivated comments. You were asked whether you held a stereotype that Indian dentistry standards were inferior to your training and standards, and you stated that those were, and indeed are, not your true beliefs, and that you instead acted impulsively, irrationally and out of frustration. You stated that you did not consider the nationality and ethnicity of Person A when sending the emails in question. You were taken to the advice given to you by the CEs in May 2023 about communicating in a professional manner. You stated that, rather than forgetting that advice, you were not thinking clearly when you sent the emails in August and September 2023. As set out above you appeared before the PCC in relation to the matters referred to above in September 2023, and in dealing with the emails that have led to this hearing you again stated that you were clouded by frustration, with the emails constituting an attempt on your part to *‘release your anger’*.

28. You stated that the experience that you have gone through has changed you, and that you have learnt the lessons, meaning that you would not express yourself in a similar manner in the future, including when under strain, and that you will not be driven by emotions again. You referred to you being more stable and resilient as a result of the learning that you have undertaken. In response to questioning about your understanding of the impact of your comments on the public’s perception of the profession, you stated that you recognise that the public would view your conduct negatively, but that it would be recognised that we are all human, that we all make mistakes, and that you would hope that your mistakes would be *‘forgiven and forgotten’*. You were also asked about fellow practitioners’ views of your conduct, and you stated that you recognise that those perceptions, too, would be negative. You were asked about your choice of using racially-motivated language notwithstanding the frustrations to which you have referred, and you stated again that your comments were illogical.
29. Having taken the evidence that you have provided into consideration, the Committee considers that, whilst your misconduct is in theory capable of being remedied, your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of misconduct. The Committee recognises that English is not your first language, and that you have endeavoured to answer the questions asked of you to the best of your ability. However, whilst you have demonstrated some insight into your misconduct, the Committee has concluded that this insight can only properly be described as limited. Similarly, whilst the Committee notes that you have taken some steps to attempt to remedy your misconduct, the Committee finds that these steps are minimal.
30. The Committee is mindful that you came before it making full admissions to the heads of charge that you face, and that you have also accepted that your conduct amounts to misconduct, and that your fitness to practise is currently impaired. These admissions and concessions connote a degree of understanding of your wrongdoing.
31. When looking at the extent and depth of your insight, the Committee considers that you do not appear to have a proper, thoroughgoing and longstanding appreciation of the very serious nature of your misconduct. In the Committee’s judgement you have not engaged properly with the nature of your misconduct, in that you have sought to downplay your culpability by referring to your comments as, for instance, *‘illogical’*, *‘nonsense’* and *‘silly’*. In the Committee’s judgement you have not demonstrated that you fully understand just how offensive your comments were, and the likely effect that they would have on the public’s perception of, trust and confidence in the profession as a whole and you in particular. The Committee is cognisant that a period of two years has elapsed since you made the comments in question, and in its judgement you have therefore had a considerable period of time in which to develop proper insight. The Committee has had regard to the evidence that you provided about the pressures that you were facing at the relevant times, but in its judgement you have provided little in the way of a coherent explanation for why you used racially motivated language. Instead, in the Committee’s judgement, you have sought to disassociate yourself from your behaviour rather than take responsibility for it. The resulting lack of insight

into the nature, gravamen and implications of your misconduct means that the Committee cannot be satisfied that a risk of you repeating your misconduct is highly unlikely. Your lack of insight is mirrored by, and is no doubt likely to have resulted in, shortcomings in your remediation.

32. In the Committee's judgement you pose a risk to the public on account of the shortcomings in your insight and remediation. The Committee considers that you are liable to repeat your misconduct, and that such a repetition entails a risk of harm to a person or persons who could receive racially motivated communications from you in the future. The Committee is not satisfied that you would respond more optimally if faced with similar or different pressures in the future, and in reaching this conclusion it is again particularly mindful of your apparent lack of understanding of the nature, seriousness and implications of your misconduct.
33. The Committee considers that a finding of impairment is also, and undoubtedly, required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour. In the Committee's judgement the public's trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulatory process, would be significantly undermined if a finding of impairment was not made given the serious nature of your misconduct. In the Committee's judgement you have in the past breached a fundamental tenet of the profession and have brought the profession into considerable disrepute. Put simply, the public should expect that no registrant would ever use racially motivated language in such circumstances. Accordingly, the Committee finds that a declaration of impairment is further required with regard to public interest considerations.

Sanction

34. The Committee then determined what sanction, if any, is appropriate in light of the findings of facts, misconduct and impairment that it has made. The Committee recognises that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have such an effect, but is instead imposed to protect patients and safeguard the wider public interests mentioned above.
35. In reaching its decision the Committee has again taken into account the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests. The Committee has once more exercised its own independent judgement.
36. The Committee has paid careful regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors present in this case.
37. In respect of the mitigating factors that are present, the Committee notes that you have expressed some remorse for your misconduct, and that you came before the Committee making full admissions to the charges that you faced. You also accepted that your actions amount to misconduct, and that your fitness to practise is currently impaired. The Committee has also found above that you have some, albeit limited, insight into your misconduct. The Committee has had regard to the amount of time that has elapsed since you sent the emails giving rise to these proceedings, with there being no reports of further incidents in the intervening period. The Committee also recognises that your conduct was not financially motivated.
38. In terms of aggravating factors, the Committee notes that you have relevant fitness to practise history with the GDC relating to unprofessional communications, which resulted in you being issued with a reprimand in one case, and receiving advice in the other, albeit with no factual findings having been made in that other case. Your misconduct was sustained and repeated over a period of approximately four weeks. Your conduct posed a risk of harm. The Committee considers that your misconduct entailed an element of premeditation, given that

you actively typed and emailed the words that you chose, and did so on four separate occasions. You also lack full insight into your misconduct.

39. The Committee has considered the range of sanctions available to it, starting with the least restrictive. In the light of its findings, the Committee considers that taking no action, or issuing a reprimand, would not be sufficient in the particular circumstances of this case. In the Committee's judgement the public would be placed at unwarranted risk of harm if no action were taken or if a reprimand were issued. Further, public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, would also be significantly undermined if no action were taken or if a reprimand were issued.
40. The Committee next considered whether a period of conditional registration would be appropriate. The Committee found that it could not identify workable conditions which would meet the public protection requirements that it has identified and with which it is satisfied that you would comply. The Committee also considers that conditions would be insufficient to address the public interest considerations engaged in this case as referred to above.
41. The Committee next considered whether a period of suspended registration would represent a suitable disposal of this case. After careful consideration, the Committee has found that a direction of suspended registration would not be sufficient to meet the risks to the public and the wider public interest in the particular, and particularly serious, circumstances of this case. The Committee considers that your misconduct represents a serious departure from the professional standards expected of a registered dentist. Your misconduct was repeated across four separate emails over a period of approximately four weeks. You have breached a fundamental tenet of the profession, namely the need to treat others with respect and not bring the profession into disrepute. The misconduct that the Committee has found, relating as it does to racially-motivated comments, connotes a deep-seated and harmful personality or professional attitudinal issue.
42. The Committee considers that you lack a proper understanding of the nature, seriousness and implications of your misconduct, and that you have not demonstrated sufficient insight into or remediation of conduct which is so damaging to your fitness to practise. In the Committee's judgement, no lesser sanction than that of erasure from the register would be sufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest considerations which are so clearly engaged in this particular case. Your unremediated behaviour presents an ongoing risk of harm to a person or persons who could receive racially motivated communications from you in the future. Further, in the Committee's view, a lesser sanction than that of erasure would not be sufficient to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain trust and confidence in the profession.
43. In the final analysis, your misconduct, and your lack of a proper understanding of it, is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration. Accordingly, the Committee directs that your name be erased from the register.
44. The Committee is aware that this decision may have serious, and indeed devastating, consequences for you. However, the Committee considers that its overarching duty to protect the public, which includes the protection of patients and the wider public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process, and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct and behaviour, outweighs your own interests in the particular circumstances of this case.

Immediate order of suspension

45. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether an immediate order of suspension is required, pending its substantive direction of erasure taking effect.

Determination on immediate order – 24 September 2025

46. Following the handing down of the Committee's foregoing determination on sanction, Mr Brassington informed the Committee that Miss Grzelczak would not be returning to the hearing.
47. The Committee has again had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
48. Ms Bird on behalf of the GDC submitted that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest. Mr Brassington on Miss Grzelczak's behalf did not oppose the making of an immediate order of suspension.
49. In all the circumstances, the Committee considers that an immediate order of suspension is necessary to protect the public and is otherwise in the public interest. The Committee has determined that, given the risks to the public and the public interest that it has identified, it would not be appropriate to permit you to practise before the substantive direction of erasure takes effect. The Committee considers that an immediate order for suspension is consistent with the findings that it has set out in its foregoing determination.
50. The effect of the foregoing determination and this immediate order is that your registration will be suspended from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served upon you. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive direction of erasure will be recorded in the register 28 days from the date of deemed service. Should you decide to exercise your right of appeal, this immediate order of suspension will remain in place until the resolution of any such appeal.
51. That concludes this case.