

## PART-PRIVATE HEARING

### Professional Conduct Committee Review Hearing

26 February 2026

**Name:** AZAM, Zeeshan  
**Registration number:** 229829  
**Case number:** CAS-204867-P6L5W6

---

**General Dental Council:** Miss Rebecca Vanstone, Counsel.  
Instructed by Jalpa Patel, IHLPS

**Registrant:** Present  
Unrepresented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Not Impaired

**Outcome:** Fitness to practise no longer impaired. Conditions allowed to lapse.

---

**Committee members:** Andy Waite (Lay)(Chair)  
Smita Rajani (Dentist)  
Alexandra Ward (Dental Care Professional)

**Legal adviser:** Valerie Paterson

**Committee Secretary:** Andrew Keeling

---

Mr Azam,

1. This was a review hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) in accordance with Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The purpose of this hearing has been for this PCC to review your case and determine what action to take in relation to your registration.
2. You were present at the hearing, but you were not represented. Miss Rebecca Vanstone, Counsel, appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC). The hearing was held remotely on Microsoft Teams.

### **Preliminary Matter**

#### **Application for the Hearing to take place in Private**

3. At the beginning of the hearing, Miss Vanstone made an application for the hearing to take place partly in private pursuant to Rule 53(1) and (2) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (the Rules). Miss Vanstone submitted that there may be reference at this hearing to your health. [PRIVATE]. Therefore, she submitted that the hearing should be in private to protect your private life [PRIVATE]. You agreed with the application. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser as to the provisions of the Rules and the approach it should take to its decision.
4. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, having regard to the circumstances of your case, the Committee determined that part of the hearing should be held in private for the reasons put forward by Miss Vanstone. The Committee was satisfied that this outweighed the public interest in open hearings. It therefore acceded to the application.

### **Background**

5. Your case was first considered by the PCC at a hearing which took place between 3 and 6 March 2025. You were present at the hearing and you were legally represented.
6. At that initial hearing, the Committee found proved, following your admission, that you failed to provide an adequate standard of care to Patient 1 on 15 March 2023 in that you incorrectly extracted their UL3. It also found that you failed to notify the GDC of a complaint made against you by Patient 1's family on 23 June 2023, in respect of this erroneous extraction, within seven days of this complaint being made. This was a requirement specified in the undertakings that you were subject to at the time. The Committee found this conduct to be misleading, albeit not intentionally, as the GDC had been misled into believing that a complaint had not been made when this was not the case. However, the Committee did not find your conduct to be lacking integrity or dishonest.

7. That initial Committee determined that the clinical failing in respect of the wrongful extraction was sufficiently serious to amount to a finding of misconduct. However, it did not consider your misleading behaviour to amount to misconduct.
8. That Committee went on to determine that your fitness to practise as a dentist was impaired by reason of your misconduct. In considering impairment, that Committee noted the remediation work you had undertaken and found that your insight into your clinical failing was well developed. [PRIVATE] Therefore, the Committee was not satisfied that your remediation and learning had been fully embedded into your clinical practice and that there was still a risk of repetition of the clinical failing, which would impact on public safety.
9. The Committee determined that a finding of impairment was necessary in the interests of public protection. It also determined that a finding of impairment was necessary in the wider public interest to maintain public confidence and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
10. The initial Committee directed to impose conditions on your registration for a period of 12 months with a review hearing at the end of the period. It determined that a conditions of practice order would be the most appropriate and suitable way for you to ensure that your remediation work has been fully embedded into your practice whilst also ensuring the public was protected. These conditions only permitted you to undertake tooth extractions whilst directly supervised. You were also required to maintain a log of any extractions undertaken.
11. The conditions of practice order is due to expire on 2 April 2026.

### Today's Review

12. It was the role of the Committee today to undertake a comprehensive review of this case. In so doing, the Committee had careful regard to all the documentary evidence before it and the submissions made by both parties. The Committee also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee had regard to the GDC's document, *'Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees' (6 January 2026)* (*'the GDC's Guidance'*).
13. Miss Vanstone, on behalf of the GDC, took the Committee through the background to the case. She reminded the Committee that the burden was on you to demonstrate that your fitness to practise is no longer currently impaired. She submitted that you have complied with the conditions on your registration. As required, you have provided the reports from your workplace supervisor and workplace reporter, and the logs detailing the extractions you have undertaken since the substantive hearing. These reports showed that no concerns have been raised about your clinical practice. She submitted that you have also provided the GDC with your updated Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP).

14. Miss Vanstone submitted that you have notified the GDC of two complaints you have received since the substantive hearing. However, she informed the Committee that the first complaint concerned treatment carried out by another dental practitioner and the second complaint related to treatment from 2018 and therefore pre-dated the matters in this case. [PRIVATE]
15. In all the circumstances. Miss Vanstone submitted that the GDC remained neutral on the question as to whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired.
16. You submitted that this case has had a very personal and profound effect on you. [PRIVATE] You have now developed a written checklist and protocol to help you with your extractions and this has been very effective.
17. Since the substantive hearing, you submitted that all of your extractions have been supervised by your workplace supervisor and all have taken place without incident. Your workplace supervisor is confident in your clinical abilities and you feel that your remediation has now been successfully embedded into your clinical practice. You are now confident when undertaking extractions. In respect of complaint handling, you submitted that you have also shown that you can report complaints appropriately by your actions in informing the GDC of the two complaints received since the substantive hearing in March 2025. [PRIVATE]. You submitted that you are now a much more rounded clinician and invited the Committee to find that your fitness to practise is no longer currently impaired.
18. In answer to a question from the Committee, you went into detail about your protocol and checklist when undertaking extractions. This included marking the relevant tooth for extraction and having a wall-mounted tooth notation chart as a visual aid. You submitted that it was a comprehensive checklist, which included cross-checking by your dental nurse, and has made the extraction procedure a very structured process, which has proved to be very effective for you. You also explained that you intend to continue with the checklist and protocol in future.

### **Decision on Current Impairment**

19. In making its decision, the Committee first sought to determine whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your misconduct. It exercised its independent judgement and was not bound by the decision of the previous committee. It balanced your interests with those of the public and bore in mind that its primary duty is to protect the public, including maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards and behaviour.
20. The Committee carefully considered all of the material in this case, which included the findings of the substantive Committee, the remediation evidence you have provided and your submissions today. The Committee noted that your misconduct concerned a discrete aspect of your clinical practice, namely extractions. The Committee took

account of the checklist and protocol you now have in place to ensure that a wrongful extraction would not be repeated. It noted that you now have a wall-mounted tooth notation chart to assist you and that you mark the tooth to be extracted. The Committee considered your checklist to be detailed and was satisfied that this would mitigate the risk of wrongful extractions taking place in the future. The Committee was also reassured that you intend to continue using the checklist in future.

21. The Committee also had sight of your PPDP and the reports from your workplace supervisor and workplace reporter. It noted from the reports that there have been no adverse incidents regarding extractions since the initial hearing. The Committee also took account of your extraction log and noted that you had undertaken a wide range of extractions, including orthodontic extractions and extractions on teeth that were decayed.
22. [PRIVATE]
23. Taking all of this into consideration, the Committee was satisfied that you have demonstrated insight into your misconduct and have fully remediated the concerns regarding your extraction practice such that have now been firmly embedded into your clinical practice and they are unlikely to be repeated. [PRIVATE]
24. The Committee concluded that there is no current evidence to show that you pose a risk to the public. The Committee is also satisfied that public confidence in the dental profession would not be undermined if a finding of impairment were not made in relation to this case.
25. The Committee, therefore, determined that your fitness to practise is currently not impaired.
26. Accordingly, the Committee determined, pursuant to Section 27C (2)(a) of the Dentists Act 1984, as amended, that the conditions currently on your registration should be allowed to lapse when they are due to expire on 2 April 2026. In making its decision, the Committee was mindful of the substantive Committee's decision that the conditions of practice order should be imposed for a period of 12 months to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour.
27. That concludes this hearing today.