

**Professional Conduct Committee
Initial Hearing****24 – 26 September 2025****Name:** HALL, Chamelle Leana Reama**Registration number:** 156551**Case number:** CAS-209776-F1L2G2

General Dental Council: Sharmistha Michaels, Counsel
Instructed by In-House Legal Presentation Service**Registrant:** Present
Unrepresented

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of misconduct
Not impaired by reason of conviction**Outcome:** Suspended with immediate suspension (with a review)**Duration:** 3 months**Immediate order:** Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Jill Crawford (Chair, lay member)
Janhvi Amin (Dentist member)
Lisa Shaw (Dental Care Professional member)**Legal adviser:** Megan Ashworth**Committee Secretary:** Sara Page (24 September 2025)
Paul Carson (25 – 26 September 2025)

CHARGE

HALL, Chamelle Leana Reama, a Dental Nurse, NVQ L3 Oral Health Care: Dental Nursing & Independent Assessment City 2004 is summoned to appear before the Professional Conduct Committee on 24 September 2025 for an inquiry into the following charge:

The Charge

“The hearing will be held to consider the following charge against you:

That being a registered dental care professional:

1. On 13/07/2021, you were convicted at Cheshire Magistrates’ Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 18/06/2021, contrary to s.5 (1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.
2. You failed to immediately inform the General Dental Council that on 13/07/2021 you were convicted of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 18/06/2021.
3. Your conduct in relation to allegation 2 was;
 - a) misleading and/or
 - b) dishonest.

AND that by reason of the matters alleged above, your fitness to practise is impaired by way of conviction and/or misconduct.”

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

1. This is a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing. The members of the Committee, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Committee Secretary, conducted the hearing remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current General Dental Council (GDC) practice.
2. You were present at the hearing and unrepresented.
3. Ms Sharmistha Michaels, Counsel, appeared as Case Presenter on behalf of the GDC.

Preliminary application

Application for the hearing to be held in private

4. At the beginning of the hearing, you made an application under Rule 53 of the '*General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006*' ('the Rules') that this hearing be held in private since reference will be made to matters relating to your private and family life. **[PRIVATE]**.
5. Ms Michaels, on behalf of the GDC, indicated that there was no opposition to the application. She reminded the Committee that it has the power to conduct these proceedings either wholly or partly in private. Ms Michaels invited the Committee to take into account that you are representing yourself at this hearing and that, without legal Counsel, you may find it difficult to request the hearing go in and out of private session.
6. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who referred it to Rule 53(2) as follows:

53.— (2) All or part of a hearing may be held in private—

(a) where the interests of the parties or the protection of the private and family life of the respondent or any other person so requires...

7. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, due to the information before it **[PRIVATE]**, the Committee was satisfied that your personal interests outweighed the public interest in this case.
8. The Committee was satisfied that the hearing should be held wholly in private in order to protect your private and family life and acceded to your application.

Charges

9. The charges being considered by the Committee, as detailed in the Notice of Hearing, dated 4 September 2025, are as follows:

'That being a registered dental care professional:

1. *On 13/07/2021, you were convicted at Cheshire Magistrates' Court of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 18/06/2021, contrary to s.5 (1)(a) of*

the Road Traffic Act 1988 and schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.

2. *You failed to immediately inform the General Dental Council that on 13/07/2021 you were convicted of Driving a Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol on 18/06/2021.*
3. *Your conduct in relation to allegation 2 was;*
 - a) *misleading and/or*
 - b) *dishonest.*

AND that by reason of the matters alleged above, your fitness to practise is impaired by way of conviction and/or misconduct.'

Admissions

10. At the outset of the hearing, you informed the Committee that you made admissions to the following charges:
 - Charge 1; and
 - Charge 2.
11. You confirmed that you deny Charges 3a) and 3b).
12. Having carefully considered each of the admissions detailed, the Committee was satisfied that your admissions were clear and unambiguous and further evidence was not required in order to explore the facts of Charges 1 and 2.
13. Accordingly, the Committee accepted your admissions in relation to the allegations listed above and found those charges proved.

Finding of facts

14. In its consideration of the remaining disputed allegations, namely Charges 3a) and 3b), the Committee had regard to the background of this case and the evidence adduced.

Background

15. On 2 August 2022, you self-referred to the GDC via email stating:

'In accordance with the guidelines, I would like to inform you of a change to my enhanced dbs. I would like to declare a driving disqualification commencing 31st August 2021- December 2022.' [sic]

16. Following requests from the GDC, you provided further information via email regarding the circumstances that led to your driving disqualification. You told the GDC in your email that you had been to a restaurant with a friend and upon leaving, noticed a sign relating to the gates being locked. You stated that you attempted to move your car out of the car park to the adjacent road within 50 yards. Your actions were observed by the police who breathalysed you and you stated that you were over the limit due to consuming alcohol with your meal. The information provided

to the GDC showed that your breathalyser results were 77 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, almost twice the legal limit, which is 35 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath.

17. You attended at Chester Magistrate's Court on 31 August 2021, were legally represented, and entered a guilty plea. You were fined £500 and disqualified from driving for 20 months.
18. You told the GDC that you were offered and took the option to undertake a driving course, which if completed before 10 October 2022, would reduce your disqualification by 22 weeks. You informed the GDC that you had scheduled the driving course for 4 September 2022. The GDC understood from its correspondence with you that you completed the course.

Evidence

19. The Committee had regard to a number of documents included within the GDC hearing bundle, referred to as Exhibit 1. This bundle included, but was not limited to, the following documents:
 - Witness statements from the following –
 - Witness 1 (GDC Caseworker in Fitness to Practise team)
 - Witness 2 (Senior Paralegal in the In-House Presentation Team)
 - Certified Court Extract from Chester Magistrates' Court (31 August 2021);
 - Police National Computer printout (3 April 2025);
 - 'Standard Directions Response Form for Unrepresented Registrants' (1 September 2025)
20. You also provided a defence bundle, referred to as Exhibit 2, which included the following:
 - Personal statement from you, (23 September 2025); and
 - [PRIVATE].

Submissions

21. Ms Michaels, on behalf of the GDC, submitted that you notified the GDC on 2 August 2022 of your conviction for drink driving, over a year from the conviction date of 13 July 2021.
22. To assist the Committee, Ms Michaels invited it to consider the GDC document, 'Standards for the Dental Team', in particular Standard 9.3.1, as follows:

9.3.1 *You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world.*
23. Ms Michaels submitted that failing to comply with Standard 9.3.1 and failing to disclose your conviction to the GDC was misleading and dishonest behaviour. She referred the Committee to relevant case law and invited the Committee to consider your actual state or knowledge of belief to the facts and whether your conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary people.

24. Ms Michaels submitted that you knew that you were obliged to report your conviction to the GDC, as per Standard 9.3.1 as evidenced by your own actions in self-referring, albeit a year later. She referred the Committee to the fact that you have been a dental nurse for some 24 years and it could not be said that you were inexperienced or unaware of the Standards. Ms Michaels submitted that your actions would be viewed on the balance of probabilities as dishonest, or at the very least, misleading. She stated that it could be inferred from facts that you did not want your conviction to impact on your registration and therefore delayed notifying the GDC for a year.
25. It was further submitted by Ms Michaels that you have not provided a full explanation for your actions until your recent response to the charge, dated two weeks ago. She stated that there is also limited information about your assertions other than your personal statement [PRIVATE]. Ms Michaels submitted that there is no information before the Committee regarding what was happening in 2021, save what was provided by you yesterday.
26. Ms Michaels therefore submitted that there is sufficient evidence before the Committee to find Charges 3a) and 3b) proved.
27. You referred the Committee to your personal statement in which you detailed the significant personal circumstances you have experienced [PRIVATE]. You stated that, as a result of these circumstances, you did not immediately notify the GDC. You disputed Ms Michaels' submission that this was to prevent notification of your conviction impacting upon your career or to avoid being prevented from working. You confirmed that your failure to notify the GDC was a result of what was happening in your life at that time and that it was not at the forefront of your mind to contact the GDC. You stated that when things had "settled down", you realised that you needed to declare your conviction to the GDC and that this was not as a result of you being "caught out or found out", as you told the GDC yourself, albeit late.

Committee's decision and reasons

28. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it and took account of the closing submissions made by Ms Michaels, on behalf of the GDC, and by you. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. It bore 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 facts are proved on the balance of probabilities.

Charge 3

3. Your conduct in relation to allegation 2 was;

- a) misleading **PROVED**; and/or*
- b) dishonest. **NOT PROVED***

29. The Committee noted that you made admissions to failing to immediately inform the GDC of your conviction but denied that this was misleading or dishonest. To assist with its decision, the Committee bore in mind the advice of the Legal Adviser who referred to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords* [2017] UKSC 67.
30. Having considered all the evidence before it, the Committee was satisfied that between 13 July 2021 and 2 August 2022, the GDC was given the wrong idea or wrong impression that you did not have a conviction for driving with excess alcohol when you did. In this case, it concluded that your failure to notify the GDC between 13 July 2021 and 2 August 2022 was misleading in that, on an objective view, the GDC was misled.

31. Accordingly, the Committee found **Charge 3a) proved**.
32. The Committee then moved on to consider whether it was dishonest that you failed to notify the GDC of your conviction. It noted that this is a subjective test and considered your state of mind at the time of the allegations.
33. You told the Committee that not notifying the GDC of your conviction in July 2021 was not a deliberate act to continue practising and referred the Committee to the significant personal difficulties you said you were experiencing at the time that meant that contacting the GDC was not at the forefront of your mind. You highlighted that you declared the conviction of your own volition rather than being “*found out*”.
34. Whilst Ms Michaels submitted that your experience as a dental nurse of some 24 years and having the knowledge that you were obliged to notify the GDC of any criminal convictions, the Committee did not think this was sufficient evidence to prove you had deliberately chosen not to inform the GDC immediately rather than had failed to do so. Despite Ms Michaels’ submission that you failed to declare the conviction in order to avoid it impacting on your registration, the Committee did not consider there to be sufficient evidence to support this contention.
35. The Committee acknowledged that the burden of proof lies with the GDC, and it is not for you to prove that you were not dishonest. However, it bore in mind the personal reasons you have cited for not making the declaration immediately and considered that these were significant events which may well have meant that the requirement to disclose your conviction to the GDC was not at the forefront of your mind. The Committee had no reason to believe that those events were untrue and noted the supporting documentation [PRIVATE].
36. There was no evidence before the Committee that you had actively and deliberately sought to conceal the information from the GDC. The Committee noted that you did make the declaration of your own volition shortly before undertaking the driving course in September 2022. In all the circumstances, the Committee was not satisfied that an ordinary person, if provided with the facts before the Committee, would consider your actions to amount to dishonest conduct.
37. Therefore, the Committee concluded that the GDC had not discharged its burden of proof that failing to immediately inform the GDC of your conviction was dishonest.
38. Accordingly, the Committee found **Charge 3b) NOT proved**.

Fitness to practise and sanction – 25 September 2025

39. Having announced its decision on the facts, the Committee then moved on to consider whether the facts found proved at charges 2 (failure to immediately inform the GDC) and 3(a) (that being misleading) amount to misconduct and, if so, whether your practice is currently impaired. In accordance with Rule 20 of the Fitness to Practise Rules 2006, the Committee heard submissions from Ms Michaels, on behalf of the GDC and from you in relation to the matters of misconduct, impairment and sanction.
40. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in relation to these matters which included reference to relevant case law.

Evidence

41. The Committee also had regard to a further bundle, referred to as Exhibit 3. This bundle consisted of the following documents:

- PNC printout; and
- Professional testimony (27 August 2025).

Submissions

42. In coming to its decision on the matter of misconduct, Ms Michaels invited the Committee to consider the definition of misconduct, as described in the case of *Roylance v General Medical Council* [2000] 1 AC 311, as being a '*word of general effect involving some act or omission which falls short of what would be proper in the circumstances... and such a falling short must be serious*'.

43. Ms Michaels referred the Committee to the GDC document, '*Standards for the Dental Team*' and detailed which Standards the GDC considers you have breached and submitted that breaches of the Standards, both individually and cumulatively, can constitute misconduct.

44. Ms Michaels [PRIVATE] She reminded the Committee that the only evidence it has in relation to the mitigation you put forward at this hearing is your most recent statement dated 23 September 2025 and a brief note in the '*Standard Directions Response Form for Unrepresented Registrants*' dated 1 September 2025. Ms Michaels submitted that you had not raised these issues with the GDC prior to 1 September 2025.

45. In all the circumstances, Ms Michaels invited the Committee to find misconduct.

46. When considering whether your misconduct and/or your conviction currently impairs your fitness to practise, Ms Michaels invited the Committee to consider whether your misconduct is remediable, whether it has been remedied, whether you have demonstrated insight, and to assess the risk of repetition. She referred the Committee to the additional documentation you have provided, including the professional testimony. She invited the Committee to find that you have provided limited evidence demonstrating insight and remediation or mitigating evidence of your health at the relevant time.

47. In assessing the risk of repetition, Ms Michaels referred the Committee to the PNC printout and highlighted four further convictions:

10 September 2010

- '*Being drunk and disorderly*' resulting in conditional discharge (six months)

13 February 2024

- '*Send by communication network offensive/indecent/obscene/menacing message or matter*' (date of incident being 26 December 2022);
- '*Send by communication network offensive message*' (date of incident being 8 July 2023);
- '*Send by communication network offensive/indecent/obscene/menacing message or matter*' (date of incident being 1 August 2023); and
- '*Battery*' (date of incident being 4 July 2023).

48. Ms Michaels submitted that these convictions occurred not long after your conviction for drink driving. She emphasised that the 2024 convictions are being investigated by the GDC and are at a very early stage, notably that there are no formal findings and the matters are not yet at the Case Examiner's stage. She acknowledged that the offences are different but there is evidence before the Committee that you have re-offended and such criminal re-offending demonstrated a lack of insight and remediation into your offence. Ms Michaels further submitted that you have failed to address the wider impact of your conviction on the public and the reputation of the profession and therefore submitted your fitness to practise remains impaired by reason of your conviction.
49. In relation to misconduct, Ms Michael submitted that there is very limited information to explain your delay in notifying the GDC of your conviction and no evidence of you understanding the importance of notifying the GDC of a criminal conviction. She submitted that your failure to immediately report the conviction demonstrated a disregard for the Standards and for your regulator in that you also continued to work during that period of time. Ms Michaels submitted that such a departure from the Standards put the public at risk of harm and that public confidence would be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made on the ground of misconduct.
50. Therefore, Ms Michaels submitted that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by way of your conviction and as a result of your misconduct.
51. Having referred the Committee to the GDC document, '*Guidance for the Practice Committees including Indicative Sanctions Guidance (December 2020)*', Ms Michaels took the Committee through the aggravating and mitigating factors that the GDC consider are relevant in your case. Ms Michaels submitted that, in all the circumstances, the GDC considers that the imposition of a suspension order for a period of six months, with a review, is the appropriate and proportionate response.
52. In your submissions, you referred the Committee to your professional testimony and confirmed that the author of that document was aware of the concerns faced by you in these proceedings. You highlighted that you are not legally represented but that you have provided all evidence requested when prompted.
53. You told the Committee that you accepted "absolutely" that you should not have sought to move your car but that your intention was to move it out of the car park rather than drive it further.
54. You stated that you were unaware that you had a duty to provide medical evidence [PRIVATE].
55. In response to Committee questions regarding the type of order proposed by Ms Michaels, you provided the Committee with information regarding your current employment status and the impact a suspension order would have on your employment and on your personal circumstances. You did not propose any other type of order.

Decision and reasons on misconduct in respect of charges 2 and 3(a)

56. In considering whether the facts found proved at charges 2 and 3(a) amounted to misconduct, the Committee had regard to the following from the '*Standards for the Dental Team*':

Standard 9.1:

You must 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

9.3.1 You must inform the GDC immediately if you are subject to any criminal proceedings anywhere in the world...

57. In its consideration of charge 2, the Committee was satisfied that by not immediately informing the GDC of your conviction until 2 August 2022, over a year later, there has been a breach of standard 9.3.1, and this would undermine the public's trust in the profession, thereby breaching standard 9.1.
58. In its consideration of Charge 3a), the Committee accepted that your misleading conduct was not a deliberate act, but a failure to pay due regard to your professional responsibilities. It concluded that you had breached standard 9.1 in that you did not ensure the public's trust in you as a dental professional.
59. Whilst the Committee acknowledged that not all breaches of the Standards amount to misconduct, it considered that the breaches in the circumstances of this case were serious departures from the conduct expected and amounted to misconduct. By failing to inform the GDC immediately of your conviction, you denied the regulator the ability to assess whether further action was necessary to protect the public or uphold the public interest. The Committee considered that your failure to give due regard to the need to communicate promptly with your regulator about your conviction, notwithstanding the difficult circumstances that you faced at that time, was a serious breach of the standards expected of you.
60. The Committee determined that this conduct fell far short of what would be proper in the circumstances and amounted to misconduct.

Decision and reasons on impairment

61. The Committee next considered whether the misconduct and the offending behaviour underlying your conviction for driving with excess alcohol is remediable, whether it had been remedied, and the risk of repetition, and had regard to the 'test' detailed in the case of *Cohen v General Medical Council* [2008] EWHC 581 (Admin). 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.

Charge 1

62. The Committee first considered the matter of impairment in relation to the conviction. The Committee bore in mind that the mischief of the conviction, namely driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, can be remediated and considered whether there was sufficient evidence before it to conclude that you have remediated your conduct.
63. The Committee also took into account your personal statement, in which you stated:

'The decision I made that evening to move my car out of the restaurant carpark came from poor judgement which I have regretted ever since that day. Although not an excuse, I would like to mention that my poor judgement was contributed to by what was happening in my life at the time...

Since the conviction I have reflected on my actions, and I took the driving awareness course which reduced my driving ban significantly.'

64. Whilst the Committee noted that this information has been provided only very recently, the Committee did not criticise you for this, acknowledging that you are not legally represented at this

hearing. The Committee had regard to your completion of the driving course, your apology for your poor decision making and the evidence that [PRIVATE]. The Committee bore in mind that your conviction took place over four years ago and there is no evidence of repetition of this offence. The Committee noted that you have been convicted of other offences but the Committee considers these are not similar in nature. The Committee concluded that your completion of the driving course, apology and [PRIVATE] indicates that the risk of repetition is low.

65. In this regard, the Committee was satisfied that whilst the public would have been at risk of harm, even for short distance driven, there was no evidence before it to indicate that there are any ongoing public protection risks relevant to dental nursing resulting from your conviction.
66. Having been unable to identify any public protection risks relating to dental nursing resulting from the underlying behaviour, the Committee concluded that a finding of impairment by reason of your conviction was not necessary on the ground of public protection.
67. The Committee then moved on to consider public interest relating to Charge 1), 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. The Committee bore in mind that you have been convicted, were fined, and were made subject of a driving ban. You have demonstrated remediation by completing the driving course, expressing remorse for your actions and [PRIVATE]. There are no further convictions of a similar nature. The Committee noted a conviction in 2010 relating to drunk and disorderly conduct but considered that the passage of time meant this conviction was no longer relevant.
68. In all the circumstances, the Committee was satisfied that an informed member of the public would not expect a finding of impairment in the particular circumstances regarding your conviction.
69. Accordingly, the Committee did not find that a finding of impairment was required, on the basis of your conviction, on the ground of public interest.

Charges 2 and 3a)

70. In its consideration of impairment by reason of misconduct in relation to your failure to immediately inform the GDC of your conviction, the Committee considered the risk of repetition. It acknowledged that you have received four subsequent convictions for offences that occurred between December 2022 and August 2023 and that there is an ongoing GDC investigation into those matters. There is no evidence before the Committee about whether or not those matters had been reported to the GDC immediately.
71. You have stated that you exhibited poor judgement in not reporting the conviction as a result of your personal circumstances [PRIVATE]. The Committee, while noting your apology, did not consider that you had demonstrated sufficient understanding of why it is important to report any relevant matters promptly to your regulator. The Committee considered that without full insight into the potential implications of such a failure, which involves denying the regulator the ability to assess whether there are public protection issues, there is a risk that you will repeat this behaviour. Although the Committee acknowledged that apologising and addressing your personal circumstances are positive steps, is not satisfied that this is sufficient to negate the risk of repetition at this time.
72. The Committee noted that no risk of harm to patients arose from your offending behaviour and therefore no direct risk of harm to patients arose from that particular failure to report. However, effective public protection relies on registrants immediately notifying the regulator about relevant

matters, including convictions, which may raise concern about their fitness to practise. Any failure to do so in the future carries a risk of harm to patients. Given the Committee's conclusion that there is a risk of repetition in this case, it concluded that there remains a risk of harm to patients.

73. Therefore, the Committee was satisfied that a finding of impairment was required on the ground of public protection.
74. In its consideration of the wider public interest, the Committee considered that, although you did not deliberately mislead your regulator, you did not pay sufficient regard to professional obligations. The Committee was of the view that the public would expect professionals to give sufficient attention to their professional responsibilities and immediately provide relevant information to their regulator in order to allow the GDC to assure itself of patient safety and public protection.
75. The Committee concluded that public trust and confidence in the profession and the upholding of professional standards required your misconduct to be marked. In all the circumstances, the Committee concluded that your fitness to practise is currently impaired on these wider grounds of public interest.

Decision and reasons on sanction

76. 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 '*Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance 2016 (ISG)*' (revised December 2020). The Committee reminded itself that any sanction imposed must be proportionate and appropriate and, although not intended to be punitive, may have that effect.
77. The Committee took into account the following mitigating features:
 - *evidence of the circumstances leading up to the incident in question;*
 - *evidence of ... apology given;*
 - *evidence of steps taken to avoid a repetition; and*
 - *the fact that the incident was a single, isolated event.*
78. The Committee also took into account the following aggravating features:
 - *misconduct sustained [by omission]... over a period of time; and*
 - *previous... convictions.*
79. The Committee acknowledged the professional testimonial that you have provided and that you have asserted that the author is aware of these proceedings and the details of the case. It noted that the testimonial is positive and speaks highly of you as a dental nurse.
80. 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.
81. The Committee first considered whether to issue a reprimand but concluded that this would be insufficient in view of the risk of repetition, the public protection concerns and the public interest concerns that have been identified in this case. The Committee concluded that it would not be sufficient for public protection nor in the public interest to allow you to practise without restriction.

82. The Committee next considered whether placing conditions on your registration would be a sufficient and appropriate response. The Committee considered the ISG, which states conditions may be suitable where most of the following factors are present:
- *there are discrete aspects of your practice that are problematic;*
 - *any deficiencies are not so significant that patients will be put at risk directly or indirectly as a result of continued – albeit restricted – registration;*
 - *you have shown evidence of insight and willingness to respond positively to conditions;*
 - *it is possible to formulate conditions that will protect the public during the period they are in force;*
83. The Committee was of the view that there are no practical or workable conditions that could be formulated given the nature of the misconduct identified. In addition, the Committee noted that you were under an obligation to immediately report your conviction to the GDC and failed to do so. Further, the Committee bore in mind that there would be no way of monitoring whether you have repeated the conduct in question by way of conditional registration.
84. The Committee then went on to consider whether a suspension would be the appropriate sanction. The ISG states suspension may be suitable where most of the following factors are present:
- *there is evidence of repetition of the behaviour;*
 - *you have not shown insight and/or poses a significant risk of repeating the behaviour;*
 - *patients' interests would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;*
 - *public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction;*
 - *there is no evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or professional attitudinal problems.*
85. The Committee considered that, although there is no evidence of repetition of the behaviour, you have not demonstrated sufficient insight into understanding the consequences of failing to immediately disclose relevant information to the regulator, as required by your professional obligations. As your actions had not been dishonest, the Committee did not consider that there was evidence of harmful deep seated personality or professional attitudinal problems. Nevertheless, the Committee concluded that patients' interests and public confidence in the profession would be insufficiently protected by a lesser sanction than suspension.
86. Balancing all these factors, the Committee directed that your registration be subject to a suspension order for a period of three months, with a review. It was satisfied that a short suspension order is necessary in order to protect patients and 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 professional.
87. The Committee determined that three months is proportionate and would allow you time to reflect on your misconduct, and to demonstrate further insight and remedial steps to address the public protection and public interest concerns identified.
88. The Committee noted the hardship the suspension may cause you, however this is outweighed by the public interest in this regard.

89. The suspension order will 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.
90. The reviewing PCC may be assisted to receive:
- A detailed reflective statement demonstrating –
 - a) your insight into, and understanding of, the impact of not immediately disclosing relevant information to the GDC;
 - b) your insight into, and understanding of, how failure to disclose relevant matters to the GDC damages the public's trust and confidence in the profession;
 - c) any remedial or preventative steps you have taken and continue to take to avoid any repetition should a similar situation arise in the future.
 - Testimonials or references demonstrating your adherence to the relevant Standards.
91. The Committee now invites submissions as to whether the suspension should take immediate effect to cover the 28-day appeal period.

Immediate order - 26 September 2025

Ms Michaels applied for an immediate order of suspension under section 36U(1) of the Dentists Act 1984.

You made no submissions on this matter.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on immediate orders.

The Committee determined that an immediate suspension order is necessary for the protection of the public and is otherwise in the public interest. It would be inconsistent with the decision the Committee had made on impairment not to make an immediate order in light of the fact that it had found a risk of repetition and a consequent risk of harm.

The effect of this immediate order is that your registration is now suspended.

Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive 3-month period of suspension will take effect upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period. Should you exercise your right of appeal, this immediate order shall remain in force pending the disposal of the appeal.

That concludes this determination.