Guidance for the Interim Orders Committee

Introduction and background

1. The aim of this Guidance is to promote consistency of approach, transparency and proportionality in decision making by the Interim Orders Committee (IOC), when it is considering a matter referred to it.

2. A registrant’s case can be referred to the IOC in accordance with the Dentists Act 1984 (“the Act”) and the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 (“the Rules), by:
   - the Registrar¹;
   - the Case Examiners²;
   - the Investigating Committee³; or
   - a Practice Committee⁴.

3. The Rules govern the procedure of the IOC and are referred to throughout this Guidance. This Guidance is periodically revised, and the current version is published on the GDC’s website. It should be read in conjunction with the IOC Conditions Bank.

4. This Guidance is intended for use by the IOC. However, it may also be helpful to:
   - registrants whose cases are referred to an IOC;
   - legal representatives appearing before the IOC;
   - a Practice Committee, when considering whether to impose an interim order as an alternative to referring the matter to an IOC; and/or
   - legal advisers who advise the IOC and/or Practice Committee.

5. An IOC conducts a risk-assessment rather than a fact-finding process. Where its test is met, the IOC can make an order suspending a registrant’s registration or imposing conditions upon their registration for a period of up to 18 months.⁵

Preliminary issues

Notice of hearing and proceeding in absence

6. The IOC may impose an interim order only if the registrant has been given an opportunity to attend and to make representations on whether an order should be made.

7. However, the IOC may proceed in the absence of the registrant if it is satisfied that the registrant has been served with notice of the proceedings. The Rules specify that the notice must be sent to the registrant in such time in advance of the IOC hearing that “may be

¹ under section 27(5)(b) of the Act
² under Rule 5(4) of the Rules
³ under section 27A(4A) or (6A) of the Act
⁴ In accordance with Rule 26(1)(c) of the Rules
⁵ See sections 32 (for Dentists) and 36V (for Dental Care Professionals) of the Act
reasonable in all the circumstances of the case”. The Rules do not, however, require the GDC to prove that the notification was received or read, only it has been served upon the registrant.

8. Given the nature of an IOC referral, in practice the GDC will aim to give registrants at least seven days' notice of the IOC hearing, but in cases of exceptional urgency, the notice period may be shorter.

Postponements and adjournments

Postponements

9. A postponement is a decision to delay the start of a hearing that has been formally listed i.e. the Notice of Hearing has been served on the registrant, but the hearing itself has not yet started. Applications for postponements can be made either by the registrant or the GDC, or the IOC can postpone the hearing of its own volition.⁶

10. An application for a postponement should be made in writing by the party requesting it and should be supported by good reasons, and evidence where possible.

11. The written application should be sent to the GDC’s Hearings team who will forward it to the other parties to proceedings and seek their representations. Both the written application and any responses will then be provided to the IOC for consideration. Such applications will then be considered as a preliminary issue by the IOC.

12. The postponement decision is at the discretion of the IOC. Such discretion will be exercised fairly, after taking account of any representations from the parties and any legal advice. The IOC’s decision must be notified to all parties providing sufficient reasons explaining the rationale behind their decision.⁷

13. If a postponement is refused, the hearing will proceed as originally planned, unless the request is renewed at the hearing itself, and the application granted.

14. If a postponement is granted, a new date for the hearing will be set, which may be before a differently constituted panel of the IOC.

Adjournments

15. Once a hearing has begun, the IOC may, at any stage during the proceedings, decide to adjourn those proceedings. Such a decision can be made following an application by the registrant, the GDC or on the IOC’s own volition.⁸

⁶ Rule 58(1) of the Rules
⁷ Dover District Council v CPRE Kent [2017] UKSC 79
⁸ Rule 58(1) of the Rules
16. If either party seeks an adjournment, they will need to explain why it should be granted. An application for adjournment must be supported by good reasons, and evidence where possible.

17. An adjournment should only be granted provided that no injustice is caused to the parties and the decision is made after hearing representations from the parties (where present) and taking advice from the Legal Adviser. Such discretion must be exercised fairly. The IOC’s decision must be notified to all parties providing sufficient reasons explaining the rationale behind their decision.

**Considerations on whether to postpone/adjourn**

18. In deciding whether to grant a postponement or an adjournment, the IOC should first explore with the party making the application whether the issue can be resolved by a short adjournment (minutes or hours) within the current listing timeframe. If not, then the IOC should consider all relevant factors when deciding whether to grant a longer postponement or adjournment, including:

- **The public interest in the expeditious disposal of the case** – there is a public interest in considering fitness to practise allegations swiftly, protecting the public and maintaining confidence in dental professionals and the GDC as a regulator.

- **The potential inconvenience caused to a party or any witness to be called by that party** – postponing or adjourning a hearing may cause inconvenience to all parties who have made themselves available to attend on the original hearing date, and who may be unable to attend a hearing at a later date.

- **Fairness to the registrant** – postponing a hearing may allow a registrant who is unable to attend the original hearing, to attend in future and give their submissions or evidence either in person or, where applicable, remotely. For example, due to short term ill health or clinical or other commitments that were arranged before they were informed of the hearing date.

**Additional considerations on whether to postpone/adjourn - particular to interim order hearings**

19. In view of the nature of interim order hearings, unless there are good and compelling reasons, postponements or adjournments should not be granted.

20. In addition to the considerations set out at paragraph [18] above, the IOC should have in mind and give such weight as is appropriate to factors which may be of importance in the context of interim order hearings, including:

- **Public protection and risk** – the need to safeguard the public against ongoing or future risk should carry considerable weight when deciding whether to postpone or.
adjourn. Whilst each case must be considered on its merits, the overarching objective to protect the public, and the public interest requirement to hear an interim order case as soon as possible, are likely to be persuasive factors in support of proceeding with a hearing. This is particularly so where the risk to the public or the wider public interest is high (an initial view as to risk may take into account the nature of the allegations, how likely the risk is to occur going forward, and what the consequences would be if it did occur). The higher the degree of risk, the less likely it may be that a postponement or adjournment will be appropriate.

**Additional time to prepare** – interim order hearings are arranged at short notice in order to provide immediate protection to the public or in the public interest. They are not fact-finding hearings but rather the IOC conducts a risk assessment based on the information available. Applications for a postponement or adjournment may be made on the basis that further notice should be provided or that further time should be allowed to prepare for a hearing. When considering a request for these reasons, the IOC should bear in mind that the Rules provide for such notification in advance “as is reasonable in the circumstances of the case”\(^{11}\). Seven days’ notice is considered to be a reasonable period of time in most instances, unless a case is particularly urgent, or complex (in which case, rarely, additional time may be needed for the registrant’s representatives to read into the case and take instructions). The IOC should also bear in mind action taken by the registrant since notice of the hearing was given, in obtaining representation or preparing for the hearing.

**Further evidence** – the role of an IOC is to carry out a risk assessment based on the information available to it so far. It is not to decide whether the allegations are true, or found proved, or to make any findings of fact. Unlike for a substantive hearing, a request to postpone or adjourn an interim order hearing so that further evidence can be obtained is unlikely to amount to a good reason for a delay – particularly where the request is related to testimonial evidence, which carries limited weight at this stage.\(^{12}\) When considering a postponement or adjournment request for this reason, the IOC should take into account that in the event the hearing proceeds and an order is imposed, there is a safeguard in place which permits the registrant to apply for an early review hearing where new evidence has become available.\(^{13}\)

**Postponements/adjournments on the grounds of ill health**

21. Where an application for a postponement or adjournment is made on the ground that the registrant is unable to attend due to ill health, independent medical evidence must be presented to the IOC that the individual is unfit to participate in the hearing, and that evidence must clearly demonstrate the individual’s condition and explain how and why that condition prevents their participation in the hearing. Such an opinion or prognosis on a registrant’s ability to participate in the hearing should be based on a proper examination by a relevant medical professional.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Rule 35(2) of the Rules
\(^{12}\) *Kumar v General Medical Council* [2013] EWHC 452 (Admin)
\(^{13}\) Section 32(5)(b) and 36V(5)(b) of the Act
\(^{14}\) *General Medical Council v Hayat* [2018] EWCA Civ 2796
22. The IOC can, if it considers it appropriate to do so, take account of its own assessment of the individual's capacity to participate effectively at a hearing, as part of its overall assessment of the evidence before it, including any expert medical evidence.\textsuperscript{15}

23. The IOC is not bound to accept the expert evidence, even if agreed. If, having weighed up all of the material before it, the IOC intends to depart from the expert medical opinion, it must do so with caution. Reasons must be given by the IOC for its decision.

*Postponements/adjournments on the grounds of seeking legal representation*

24. A registrant does not have an unfettered right, in any case, to insist on instructing a legal representative, regardless of the consequences for the public interest and the other parties involved.\textsuperscript{16}

25. Where an application for a postponement or adjournment is made at the outset of the hearing on the ground that the registrant wishes to obtain legal representation in the first instance (or new representation) to assist them at the hearing, the considerations to which the IOC must have regard, remain those set out at paragraphs [18] to [20] above.

26. If the IOC decides to refuse such an application at the outset of a hearing, it is open to them to keep their decision under review throughout the proceedings if they subsequently consider that a registrant cannot properly put forward their case, or properly represent themselves without further assistance from a legal representative.

*Joint IOC hearings*

27. There is no specific provision in the Rules which allows for a joint IOC hearing to take place where the concerns relate to more than one registrant. However, the courts have held that the expeditious and efficient disposal of regulatory proceedings serves to protect the public and the wider public interest.

28. As a result, there may be circumstances in which a joint hearing relating to two or more registrants is considered to be in the public interest and is convened by the GDC. This is most likely to occur where the issues relating to the registrants concerned are similar. For example, they relate to management issues surrounding a practice which is jointly run by the registrants concerned or where there is alleged to be joint misconduct.

29. In those circumstances, the GDC may make one set of submissions covering both cases and/or may make separate submissions highlighting any particular or separate concerns about each registrant.

30. The IOC should, however, consider each case on its individual merits and should give a separate determination for each case.

\textsuperscript{15} Maitland-Hudson v Solicitors Regulation Authority [2019] EWHC 67 (Admin)

\textsuperscript{16} Hussain v General Pharmaceutical Council [2016] EWHC 656 (Admin)
Registrants with existing restrictions on registration

Registrants with existing restrictions

31. The IOC may exercise its functions only in relation to a person whose case has been referred to the IOC by the Registrar, the Case Examiners, the Investigating Committee or a Practice Committee. Because there are different routes of referral, and because it is possible that one registrant will have multiple separate fitness to practise investigations at different stages of the GDC’s processes, the IOC may, on occasion, be asked to consider imposing an interim order where a registrant has an existing interim or substantive order of conditions or suspension.

32. In those circumstances, the IOC should consider whether the new matter referred to it meets the threshold for the imposition of an interim order, taking into account the evidence available in that case, as well as the degree to which the risk to the public, the public interest, or the registrant’s own interests, is mitigated by the existing restrictions.

Existing substantive order of conditions

33. Where there is an existing substantive order of conditions, the IOC’s assessment of risk should include an analysis of:

(i) the new concerns, and the risk occasioned to the public, the public interest, and the registrant’s own interests
(ii) what the existing restrictions are (including which areas of the registrant’s practice are currently restricted) and why they were imposed
(iii) the term of those restrictions (i.e. the period until the next Practice Committee review), and
(iv) the time period to which the new concerns relate, i.e. have the new concerns arisen when the registrant’s practice was already restricted.

34. If the new concerns pre-date the imposition of the substantive conditions, then the IOC should consider whether any risks identified are wholly mitigated by the substantive order. If so, it may not be necessary for the protection of the public, otherwise in the public interest, or in the interests of the registrant for an order to be imposed.

35. However, the IOC should bear in mind that any substantive restrictions upon registration will in due course be reviewed by a Practice Committee whose primary focus will be determining whether the registrant’s fitness to practise remains impaired on the ground(s) previously identified. Although the reviewing Practice Committee may be made aware of the existence of new concerns about the registrant’s fitness to practise, those new concerns are – bearing in mind their unproven nature - unlikely to play a significant role in the Practice Committee’s decision making on impairment or sanction.

36. In such cases, the IOC should consider the remaining term of the substantive order and whether it is possible that, following review, any substantive restrictions will fall away during the lifetime of the new case, leaving an unmitigated risk until a further referral to the IOC can be made. In those circumstances, the IOC may, if its test is met, consider it appropriate
to impose an interim order to run in parallel with the substantive conditions to avoid any gap in the protection afforded to the public, the public interest, or the registrant’s own interests.\(^\text{17}\)

37. If on the other hand, the concerns have arisen during the term of the existing substantive conditions, or they relate to different or wider concerns, then those existing restrictions may be insufficient. In those circumstances, where the IOC considers that the test for imposing an interim order is met, it should first consider whether to impose more wide-ranging or more stringent conditions in order to address the risks identified. If, however, it determines that conditions are not suitable or workable, then it should go on to consider whether to impose an order of interim suspension.

**Existing substantive order of suspension**

38. Where the registrant is subject to an existing substantive order of suspension, then the issue of current or future risk should be considered carefully by the IOC.

39. As with existing substantive conditions, the IOC should bear in mind that a substantive order of suspension will in due course be reviewed by a Practice Committee whose primary focus will be determining whether the registrant’s fitness to practise remains impaired on the ground(s) previously identified. Although the reviewing Practice Committee may be made aware of the existence of new concerns about the registrant’s fitness to practise, those new concerns are – bearing in mind their unproven nature – unlikely to play a significant role in the Practice Committee’s decision making on impairment or sanction.

40. As a result, it is possible that, following review, a substantive suspension will fall away during the lifetime of the new case, leaving an unmitigated risk until a further referral to the IOC can be made. In those circumstances, the IOC may, if its test is met, consider it appropriate to impose an interim order to run in parallel with the substantive suspension to avoid any gap.

**Existing interim order**

41. Where a registrant has an existing interim order of conditions or suspension, and a further IOC referral is made, there are two possible approaches:

   (i) to consider whether to make one order covering both the existing concerns and the new referral, or

   (ii) for a further/parallel interim order to be made, covering the new referral alone.

42. In order for option (i) to be available to the IOC, an early review of the existing order must be convened on the basis that there may be new evidence relevant to the existing order (that new evidence being the new concerns) and the notification of hearing sent accordingly.\(^\text{18}\) If it has not been, the IOC may consider adjourning in order for the matter to be relisted so that both matters may be considered together. However, in making that assessment the IOC should consider whether the benefit of making one order covering

---

\(^{17}\) as the Act provides the IOC with discretion to make parallel interim orders

\(^{18}\) Section 32(5)(b) of the Act
both the existing concerns and the new referral, is outweighed by the risk created in delaying their consideration of the matter,

43. Option (i) may be appropriate where the concerns about the registrant have a common nexus (for example, the registrant’s health) or where there is a possibility that the new concerns may ultimately be joined to the existing concerns and considered at the same substantive hearing. In those circumstances, the IOC should conduct a holistic risk assessment and should determine whether, based on the totality of the concerns before it, the test for imposing an interim order is met.

44. Alternatively, option (ii) may be considered where the existing concerns and the new referral are separated in time and/or are unrelated in subject matter. In those circumstances, the IOC should consider whether the new matter referred to it meets the threshold for the imposition of an interim order, taking into account the evidence available in that case, as well as the degree to which the risk to the public, the public interest, or the registrant’s own interests, is mitigated by the existing restrictions.

45. As with cases where there is a substantive order in force, the IOC’s assessment of risk should include an analysis of:

(i) the new concerns, and the risk occasioned to the public, the public interest, and the registrant’s own interests
(ii) what the existing restrictions are (including which areas of the registrant’s practice are currently restricted) and why they were imposed
(iii) the term of those restrictions (i.e. the period until the next Practice Committee review), and
(iv) the time period to which the new concerns relate, i.e. have the new concerns arisen when the registrant’s practice was already restricted.

46. Even where there is an interim order already in place that appears to address the risks identified by the IOC, the IOC should bear in mind that that order will have been imposed in relation to a separate case, and therefore may fall away if the risk assessment for that case changes or the case is closed. In those circumstances, the IOC may, if its test is met, consider it appropriate to impose a further interim order to run in parallel with the existing interim order, to avoid any gap should the existing interim order lapse.

**Hearing**

**Hearing in public**

47. In principle, IOC hearings are held in public, although the IOC has discretion to allow a hearing to proceed in private in certain circumstances, which include:¹⁹

¹⁹ Rule 53 of the Rules
• where it is necessary to protect the interests of the parties or the protection of the private and family life of the registrant or any other person so requires – for example, where the registrant’s health is concerned, or
• where the IOC is of the opinion that publicity would prejudice the interests of justice.

48. The IOC should invite representations from the registrant and the GDC and take advice from the legal adviser before making a decision to hear a case in private.

49. Even where all or part of the hearing is held in private, the IOC should still ensure that its decisions are recorded and that reasons are given. A shortened determination is read out in public when any part of the hearing is held in private.

Mode of hearing

50. IOC hearings are predominantly held remotely using video conferencing facilities. More about the process for agreeing the mode of hearing can be found on the GDC’s website.

51. IOC Review hearings are routinely conducted ‘on the papers’ unless an oral hearing is requested by either party.

Test to be applied and approach

52. As a statutory committee of the GDC, the IOC has a duty to act in accordance with the overarching objective when exercising its functions. The pursuit of the overarching objective includes:

• protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and wellbeing of the public
• promoting and maintaining public confidence in the dental and dental care professions, and
• promoting and maintaining proper professional standards and conduct for members of the dental and dental care professions.

53. The IOC can impose an interim order where it is:

   (i) necessary for the protection of the public
   (ii) is otherwise in the public interest, and/or
   (iii) is in the interests of the person concerned.

54. An interim order may be made for a period of up to 18 months.

55. The need for a referral to the IOC may arise at any time during an investigation e.g. upon receipt of a concern, upon notification of criminal proceedings or criminal conviction, upon receipt of a witness statement or an expert report, or when the matter is considered by Case Examiners.

---

20 For example, juvenile or other vulnerable witnesses, or where the allegation relates to sexual misconduct and holding the hearing in public might lead to identification of the alleged victim.
56. The IOC conducts an assessment of the risks to the public, public interest, and/or the registrant’s own interests, if the registrant were able to continue to practise until the matter is determined by a Practice Committee. The rules are silent as to the threshold test and the IOC may make an order when a decision has not yet been made that there is a case to answer. It is the current risk that is important, and risk should be considered as at the time of making or reviewing an order. However, the IOC should not attach weight to any offer by the registrant to provide voluntary undertakings, as unlike an interim order, these cannot be monitored or enforced by the GDC.

57. In conducting a risk assessment, the IOC should not engage in fact finding or resolve conflicts of evidence. As the IOC will often be considering a matter at an early stage of the investigation, it may only have limited information available. This will include circumstances where allegations of criminal conduct have been referred to the police, and the GDC is not able to obtain further information due to the risk of prejudicing the ongoing criminal investigation.

58. The IOC should conduct a risk assessment on the basis of the information before it and should weigh the cogency and credibility of that information.

59. The registrant’s previous or current fitness to practise history with the GDC may also be a relevant factor for the IOC to take into account when conducting its risk assessment.

**Grounds for imposing an order: necessary for the protection of the public**

60. The IOC must be satisfied on all the available information before it that an order is necessary for the protection of the public: that is to say, there is a real risk of harm to the health, safety or wellbeing of a patient, visitor, colleague or other member of the public if the registrant is allowed to practise without restriction.

61. In assessing the risk to members of the public, the IOC will consider the seriousness of the matter, the cogency and weight of the evidence, including evidence about the likelihood of repetition should the registrant continue to hold unrestricted registration while the matter is investigated.

62. An interim order is an emergency measure. A referral should be made promptly after the receipt of information that a registrant may pose immediate risk. The panel should, however, recognise that such information may be received at the time the GDC became aware of an issue or at any time thereafter. A delay without good reason could reduce the likelihood of the order being made. The longer it takes a regulator to make an application for an interim order (without good reason) from the receipt of information that suggests a registrant may pose an immediate risk to the public, the less likely it will be that an order based on the need to protect the public will be made.

63. Categories of cases where it may be necessary for the protection of the public to impose an interim order include:

---

21 Perry v Nursing & Midwifery Council [2013] EWCA Civ 145
22 Bradshaw v General Social Care Council [2010] UKFTT3 (HESC)
• Clinical cases.
• Where there are concerns that the registrant does not have adequate and appropriate indemnity insurance.
• Where the registrant is not cooperating with the GDC’s investigation.
• Where there are concerns that the registrant has acted outside their scope of practice.
• Where there are concerns about the registrant’s personal conduct including sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, or violence.
• Where the registrant is unwell and is not following medical advice.

Clinical cases

64. Clinical concerns which may cross the threshold for IOC consideration include:

• deficiencies in the standard of care provided to multiple patients, particularly where there is a lack of basic clinical knowledge or skills (which may include evidence of failings in basic and fundamental aspects of dentistry), and/or that the registrant has provided treatment which he or she was not competent to provide
• other aspects of care causing risk to patients or colleagues, including failure to wear appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), or failure to otherwise take adequate precautions in respect of cross-infection control, and/or
• where restrictions (suspension or conditions) have been imposed by the NHS or by national care services regulators Care Quality Commission (England), Health Inspectorate Wales, Care Inspectorate/Healthcare Inspectorate Scotland, and Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority (Northern Ireland) and there is a need to consider whether those restrictions should be replicated to protect patients or colleagues in other settings.

65. In those circumstances, the IOC should consider the current risk, which will include an assessment of whether the allegations are current or historic, and whether there is evidence to suggest that the conduct will be repeated.

Indemnity

66. All dental professionals must, by law, have an indemnity arrangement or insurance policy in place. That is so any patient who suffers harm can recover any money they might be entitled to through compensation, in the event of a successful claim.

67. Where a registrant does not hold adequate and appropriate indemnity insurance, it creates a risk of financial harm to patients, who may not be able to claim any compensation to which they may be entitled, should there be issues with their treatment. As a result, such cases may be referred to the IOC for consideration.

68. When considering a case involving an alleged lack of indemnity insurance, the IOC should risk assess by considering factors including:
• whether there is evidence that the registrant has indemnity insurance providing cover to current patients and to those who have had past treatment (so that a patient can seek compensation if they suffer harm)
• if there are periods where a registrant has practised without cover, what the reasons were for that – the risk of repetition is likely to be lower in circumstances where the lack of cover was inadvertent than where it was deliberately cancelled
• whether there are any associated probity concerns e.g. misleading or dishonest behaviour towards patients or the GDC (for example, where an inaccurate disclosure about indemnity status was made at the point of renewal of registration) which again, may raise the risk of repetition
• if there are any allied scope of practice issues (see below) or other clinical concerns, and/or
• any relevant fitness to practise history.

Non-cooperation

69. The GDC issues guidance as to the standards of conduct, performance and ethics. That guidance states that registrants must co-operate with any relevant formal or informal inquiry and give full and truthful information. Further, it states that if a registrant receives a letter from the GDC in connection with concerns about their fitness to practise, they must respond fully within the time specified in the letter.

70. Failure by a registrant to cooperate with a GDC investigation is likely to have the effect of depriving the GDC of the opportunity to investigate the underlying concerns about the registrant’s fitness to practise. In particular, it may mean the GDC is unable to investigate whether, for example:

• where the allegations concern the registrant’s health (or have the potential to concern the registrant’s health, if they relate to a drug or alcohol related conviction or caution), if there is an underlying health issue which might impair the registrant’s fitness to practise
• the registrant has adequate and appropriate indemnity insurance
• there are any other concerns about the registrant’s conduct, performance or health which might be raised by employer enquiries
• where the case relates to clinical treatment, the standard of care provided to the patient(s) concerned was at, below, or far below the standard to be expected.

71. As a result, failure to cooperate with a GDC investigation may create a risk to the public. However, again, the IOC should assess the current risk. That risk may be mitigated if the registrant is, by the time of the IOC hearing, cooperating with the GDC.

Conduct concerns include sexual misconduct or harassment, violence

72. Sexual misconduct encompasses a wide range of conduct, from criminal convictions for sexual offences (sexual assault, child sexual abuse, and pornography) to sexual misconduct with patients or colleagues.
73. In assessing the risk to the public (patients, colleagues or visitors), the IOC should evaluate a range of factors relating to the specific allegation, including whether:

- there was abuse of a position of trust
- the registrant otherwise used their professional position to pursue a sexual or improper emotional relationship with a vulnerable patient
- the victim was aged under 18 years of age at the time of the conduct
- there was an imbalance of power between the registrant and the victim by reason of their respective professional positions, age, and/or physical stature
- the incident was premeditated, calculated or deliberate
- the incident took place in circumstances where the victim was isolated
- there was an impact upon the victim’s physical or emotional wellbeing either immediately after the event or subsequently
- the incident was part of a course of conduct, and/or
- the incident involved touching.

74. The IOC should also consider, in assessing the risk of repetition, whether the registrant has any previous similar history, either with the GDC, or at the practice or Trust level at the registrant’s place of work.

75. In terms of risk, even if the likelihood of repetition is perceived to be low, the impact of repetition may be high and the overall risk to the public may reasonably be judged to be high, such that an order is necessary for the protection of the public.

76. In addition, mainstream opinion is now that there is virtually zero tolerance of sexual misconduct; as such, sexual misconduct by dental professionals seriously undermines public confidence in the dental professions. As a result, cases relating to sexual misconduct are inherently serious, and therefore, the need to promote and maintain public confidence, and to promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct, may require an interim order to be imposed, even where the risk of repetition is low.23

**Scope of practice**

77. The guidance issued by the GDC as to the standards of conduct, performance and practice state that dental professionals must work within their knowledge, skills, professional competence and abilities, and must only carry out a task or a type of treatment if they are appropriately trained, competent, confident and indemnified.

78. Undertaking work outside scope of practice is a fundamental breach of a registrant’s regulatory responsibilities, puts patients at risk, and may tend to bring the profession into disrepute. The issue for the IOC is whether the risk to the public and wider public interest is a current risk.

79. In assessing current risk, the IOC should consider whether:

- the registrant’s actions resulted in patient harm

---

23 Arunachalam v The General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 758 (Admin)
• the allegations are current or historic
• the registrant’s actions were accidental or inadvertent, or a deliberate breach
• the incident was isolated, or took place on more than one occasion, and/or
• there is other evidence to suggest that the conduct will be repeated, which may include an assessment of any relevant fitness to practise history.

Health concerns

80. Where there are health concerns, the IOC should consider whether these present a risk to the public. In that regard, the IOC may be guided by any health assessment report which is available, and which may comment upon whether the registrant is fit to practise unrestricted. Otherwise, factors which may point towards an interim order being imposed on public protection grounds include:

• where it is alleged that the registrant has attended their practice unfit for work, through alcohol, drugs or otherwise, and/or
• where it is alleged that the registrant is not following medical advice.

Grounds for imposing an order: otherwise in the public interest

Public interest

81. As well as protection of the public, the public interest includes:

• promoting and maintaining public confidence in the dental professions, and
• promoting and maintaining proper professional standards and conduct for members of the dental professions.24

82. In practice, there may be some overlap between cases in which an interim order is necessary for the protection of the public, and where an interim order may also be otherwise in the public interest.

83. However, there will also be cases where an interim order solely on the basis of the public interest is sought in order to maintain public confidence in the dental professions and uphold proper professional standards, pending the final outcome of fitness to practise proceedings.

84. In deciding whether to impose an interim order, the IOC will consider whether serious damage will be caused to public confidence in the dental professions and the maintenance of good standards if an order is not imposed, and whether an informed member of the public looking on would be surprised, dismayed, shocked or troubled, if the IOC did not make an order in respect of a matter that was later found proved.

85. Allegations which have the potential to damage public confidence in the dental professions include:

24 Section 1(ZA) and 1(ZB) of the Act
• allegations of serious and/or persistent dishonesty
• allegations of sexual assault or persistent harassment on the grounds of sex, or another protected characteristic (see also paragraph [74] above)
• serious cross-infection control breaches or serious breaches of guidance relating to the COVID-19 pandemic
• scope of practice concerns, particularly where it is deliberate or persistent
• failure to hold adequate and appropriate indemnity insurance, and/or
• financial or other exploitation of elderly and/or vulnerable patients.

86. It will be a relatively rare case where an *interim suspension order* is made solely on the basis of the public interest. Although the Act does not use the word “necessary” for this ground, it does at least carry some implication of necessity and desirability.

**Criminal proceedings**

87. In any case where there are ongoing criminal proceedings, the IOC should consider the seriousness of the underlying offence as well as whether, in the event that the registrant is later convicted, it will damage public confidence that they have been able to continue working unrestricted in the meantime.

88. Cases where there is likely to be particular damage to public confidence should the registrant ultimately be convicted include:

• where there are allegations of child sexual abuse (including pornography)
• allegations of rape or sexual assault
• allegations of serious violence, and/or
• serious dishonesty or other fraud (particularly on patients or the public purse).

89. The IOC may also wish to take into account, when considering the public interest, whether there are any allied probity concerns, for example a failure to be open and honest with an employer, the NHS or the GDC, about the criminal matters.

90. When considering a case where the registrant has been convicted and is still subject to a criminal sentence (including a suspended sentence of imprisonment, or a community penalty) or a requirement to be entered onto the register of sex offenders, the IOC should take account of the principle referenced in the case of *Fleischmann* i.e. that where a registrant has been convicted of a serious criminal offence, or offences, they should not be permitted to resume practice until they have satisfactorily completed that sentence.

91. Such cases are therefore likely to require an interim order which runs alongside the criminal penalty. Where the IOC determines that an alternative course of action is appropriate, it must give clear reasons for that decision.

---

25 *Sheikh v General Dental Council [2007] EWHC 2972 (Admin)*: on its facts, the case related to an order of interim suspension rather than interim conditions

26 As outlined in the case of *CHRP v (1) GDC and (2) Fleischmann [2005] EWHC 87 (Admin)*
Grounds for imposing an order: registrant’s own interests

92. This ground may apply where the registrant is ill and does not recognise it, or there are other factors suggesting a lack of insight, where the registrant needs to be protected from themselves.

93. This may include where the registrant is suffering from drug or alcohol related issues or has mental health issues which are particularly severe (for example, where the registrant has been admitted as an in-patient for psychiatric treatment), and/or there is evidence to suggest that the registrant is not complying with medical advice.

94. The IOC should look at the risk of harm in the future if there is no restriction on registration.

Assessment of risk: testimonial evidence

95. The IOC may be asked to consider testimonial evidence from colleagues and others, regarding the registrant’s character and/or clinical competence.

96. However, the IOC is conducting a risk assessment. The fact that a registrant has on many occasions been a competent practitioner and has made a good impression on colleagues and patients, is not inconsistent with the same registrant having performed below a level of competence on other occasions27, and is not determinative of the question of current risk to the public. That principle applies equally to allegations concerning the registrant’s personal behaviour.

97. As a result, testimonial evidence may be of limited weight in respect of the risk assessment to be conducted by the IOC.

Proportionality

98. As set out above, the IOC should first consider whether an order is necessary for:

- the protection of the public, or
- is otherwise in the public interest, or
- is in the interests in the registrant concerned.

99. Once that threshold is passed, an order made by the IOC should be proportionate to the risk involved. The IOC should therefore impose the minimum restriction necessary:

- to protect the public
- in the public interest, or
- the interests of the registrant.

100. As such, the IOC should first consider whether to impose interim conditions of practice on the registrant’s registration. If it considers that interim conditions of practice are inappropriate, the IOC must consider whether to impose an interim suspension order.

---

27 Kumar v General Medical Council [2013] EWHC 452 (Admin)
101. An interim order for conditions of practice can only be appropriate when there is reasonable confidence in the registrant’s capacity to comply with them. If circumstances prevent the registrant from complying with possible interim conditions, then the IOC must consider whether to impose an interim suspension order.

102. When imposing interim conditions of practice, the IOC will have regard to the ‘IOC Conditions Bank [insert date following consultation]’. In general terms however, interim conditions of practice should be:

- Workable.
- Enforceable.
- Clear.
- Relevant.
- Addressed to the registrant (not to third parties).
- Proportionate to the issues identified.
- Formulated so that the interim conditions are not in effect an interim suspension.
- Written in such a way that compliance can be monitored.

103. The purpose of imposing interim conditions of practice is to ensure that the public is protected, pending final determination of a matter. It is not to impose conditions for the purpose of remediation following a finding of impaired fitness to practise.

104. In considering whether interim conditions of practice are workable, compliance by the registrant with any conditions previously imposed may be a relevant factor.

105. If, however, conditions are not suitable or workable, or are insufficient to protect the public or the wider public interest, an order of interim suspension may be imposed.

**Period of order**

106. Where the IOC imposes an interim order, it must specify the length of the order and give reasons for the period of time imposed. The maximum period for which an initial order may be imposed is 18 months, however there are circumstances in which an order for a shorter period of time would be a proportionate response.28

107. In considering the period for which an order should be imposed an IOC should consider the time that is likely to be needed before the matter is resolved (for example, the time needed to complete the fitness to practise investigation and for the case to be listed for hearing by a Practice Committee).

108. If the IOC wishes to extend an order beyond the period initially set, the GDC will need to apply to the relevant Court to do so.29

---

28 Harry v GMC [2012] EWHC 2762 (Admin)
29 See section 32(8) and 32(9) of the Act. On each application, the Court (the Court of Session where the registrant’s registered address is in Scotland, the High Court in Northern Ireland where the registrant’s address is in Northern Ireland, or for any other person, the High Court in England and Wales) may extend - or further extend - for up to twelve months the period for which the order has effect.
Reasons for decisions

109. When it announces its decision, the IOC is required to give reasons for that decision, including a decision not to impose an order.\(^{30}\)

110. While the courts do not expect an IOC to give detailed reasons, the reasons given must be clear and explain how any decision was reached, including identifying the interest(s) for which the order is considered necessary, so it is clear that the proper test has been applied on the basis of the information before the IOC.

111. Although IOC decisions should be concise, they ought to include the following details, with specific reference to the particular facts of each individual case:

- the risk to patients so as to demonstrate the proportionality of any action taken
- the risk to public confidence in the dental professions if the registrant was able to continue working without any restriction on their registration, and the matter is later proved, to demonstrate the proportionality of any interim action taken
- where an order is made primarily because it is desirable in the public interest to uphold public confidence and there are no public protection concerns, specific reasons should be given for why this is appropriate
- reasons for the period of time for which an interim order is imposed
- where no order is imposed, the reasons for this.

Review and revocation

112. The IOC must review any order it makes within six months of it being made, and thereafter within six months of the previous review.\(^{31}\) The IOC must also review an order at the registrant’s request, if at least three months have elapsed since the previous review.

113. In addition, an order may be reviewed if new evidence relevant to the order has become available to the making of the order. From the registrant’s perspective, that new evidence may include evidence that an order is no longer required, for example, where parallel regulatory restrictions imposed by another regulator or the NHS - and which were a primary factor in the interim order being imposed and/or continued - have been lifted.

114. The fact that a police investigation has now concluded with no further action being taken against the registrant is also a change of circumstance which may lead to an order being reviewed. However, the fact that criminal proceedings have been discontinued is not necessarily itself a reason for an interim order to be lifted, bearing in mind that the GDC

\(^{30}\) Rule 36(d) of the Rules

\(^{31}\) In addition, section 32(11)/36V(11) of the Act provides that where an order which has not yet been reviewed is extended by the court or replaced by the IOC, it must be reviewed within 6 months of the date of extension/replacement. If the order had previously been reviewed, a further review must take place within 3 months of that previous review.
works to a different standard of proof, and is likely to consider the underlying conduct under its own fitness to practise procedures.

115. From the GDC’s perspective, that new evidence may include evidence that the order previously imposed is no longer suitable or workable, including where there has been a breach of conditions or further concerns have otherwise arisen during the term of the order.

116. Upon review the IOC may:

(i) revoke the order
(ii) add to, vary or revoke any conditions imposed by the order
(iii) replace an interim suspension order with an order for interim conditional registration, or vice versa, to have effect for the remainder of the order.

117. A review hearing may be conducted orally. In addition, a review may be conducted on the basis of the papers alone provided that:

(i) Both parties are in agreement that the IOC hearing may proceed in the absence of the parties and on the basis of written submissions.

(ii) There is no material change in circumstances and both parties are in agreement that they are content for the current interim order to continue without any changes (e.g. provided no information has been received since the last IOC hearing which indicates that the order ought to be varied or changed from an Interim Suspension Order to an Interim Conditions of Practice Order, or vice versa).

(iii) That, where an Interim Conditions of Practice Order has been imposed, the registrant has complied with the interim conditions of practice and where necessary, has demonstrated compliance (e.g. a supervisor’s report should be provided by the registrant/on behalf of the registrant if one of the interim conditions requires that this is provided in advance of any IOC review hearing).

(iv) The registrant/the registrant’s representative confirms in writing that the registrant:

- is not opposed to the continuation of the interim order and understands it is likely in the circumstances that the order will continue
- will not be attending the review hearing
- will not be represented at the review hearing
- understands that the hearing will proceed in their absence, and
- agrees to the IOC considering the continuation of the interim order ‘on the papers’ rather than at a hearing.

118. If those requirements are not met, then the order will instead be reviewed at an oral hearing.

119. At each review, the IOC should conduct a fresh risk assessment to determine whether the grounds for an order are now met. The options available to the IOC at a review hearing are
set out at Section 32(6) of the Act and are detailed at paragraph [114] above. Those options include revocation of the interim order.\footnote{see section 32(6)(a)/section 36V(6)(a) of the Act}

120. In addition, the Act and Rules also provide for revocation of an interim order in circumstances where:

(i) an interim order has been made in respect of an allegation or allegations which are then closed by the investigating committee, either initially (including by way of undertakings) or upon review\footnote{see section 27A(10)/36O(10) of the Act}

(ii) an interim order has been made in respect of an allegation or allegations which are then closed by the Case Examiners, either initially (including by way of undertakings) or upon review,\footnote{see Rule 6(5) of the Rules (initial consideration), Rule 6A(3)(b) of the Rules (undertakings) and Rule 6E(3) of the Rules (review)} or

(iii) an interim order has been made in respect of an allegation or allegations which are then the subject of a substantive determination by a Practice Committee.\footnote{see section 27B(9) of the Act}
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