

**SINGAPORE DENTAL COUNCIL  
DISCIPLINARY INQUIRY AGAINST  
DR. SNG WEE HOCK, DR. JUN SOO LEE AND DR. PARK SEUNGHYUN  
HELD ON 28 JUNE 2017**

**Disciplinary Committee:**

Dr. Hwang Yee Cheau (Chairman)  
Dr. Chan Siew Luen  
Dr. Ong Kheng Kok  
Mr. Vijai Parwani (Lay Person)

**Legal Assessor:**

Mr. Giam Chin Toon, SC

**Prosecution Counsel – TSMP Law Corporation**

Mr. Thio Shen Yi  
Ms. Michelle Chew

**Defence Counsel – MyintSoe & Selvaraj**

Mr. S Selvaraj  
Mr. Edward Leong

**DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

*Note: Certain information may be redacted or anonymised to protect the identity of the parties.*

**FACTS**

1. Dr. Sng Wee Hock (1st Respondent) is a dentist registered under Section 14 of the Dental Registration Act (“DRA”).
2. Dr. Jun Soo Lee (2nd Respondent) and Dr. Park Seunghyun (3rd Respondent) were granted conditional registration under Section 14A of the DRA.
3. All 3 Respondents worked at WH Dental Surgeons (“WH Dental”) with clinics situated at 3 locations:
  - i. 1 Hougang Street 91 #01-16/17, Singapore 538692 (“Hougang clinic”).
  - ii. 33 Sengkang West Avenue #03-34, The Seletar Mall, Singapore 796653 (“Seletar clinic”).

- iii. Block 198, Punggol Field #02-01, Singapore 820198 (“Punggol clinic”).
4. The 1st Respondent had worked at WH Dental from 14 March 2003 to 16 May 2015 and he was assigned to supervise the 2nd and 3rd Respondents who were granted conditional registration by the Singapore Dental Council (“SDC”) on the following dates:
  - i. 22 October 2014 (2nd Respondent)
  - ii. 1 April 2015 (3rd Respondent)
5. By way of a Statutory Declaration (“SD”) dated 9 May 2015, a former employee of WH Dental laid a complaint that the 2nd and 3rd Respondents were working without the supervision of the 1st Respondent at WH Dental clinics.
6. As a result of the complaint, charges were preferred against each of the Respondents.
7. At the hearing:
  - i. 1st Respondent pleaded guilty to 2 charges:

1st Charge

*That you, DR SNG WEE HOCK over the period 27 October 2014 to 16 May 2015, whilst practising as a dentist at WH Dental Surgeons, whose clinics include those at 1 Hougang Street 91 #01-16/17, Singapore 538692 (“the Hougang clinic”), 33 Sengkang West Avenue #03-34, The Seletar Mall, Singapore 796653 (“the Seletar clinic”) and Block 198, Punggol Field #02-01, Singapore 820198 (“the Punggol clinic”) (collectively, the “WH Dental Clinics”), failed to provide supervision of Dr. Jun Soo Lee (DCR No. D25311A) (“Dr. Lee”) who was registered as a dentist with conditional registration under Section 14A of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76), to wit:*

Particulars

- a. *You were approved by the Council as the fully registered dentist to supervise Dr. Lee.*

- b. *You were reminded by the Council on 3 September 2014, 29 January 2015 and 8 April 2015 that you were to supervise any dentists registered with conditional registration under your supervision and that the supervisor must work in the same clinic as the supervisee.*
- c. *Over the period from 27 October 2014 to 16 May 2015 you allowed Dr. Lee to work independently from you at the WH Dental Clinics and you failed to supervise Dr. Lee.*
- d. *You breached your duties as supervisor of Dr. Lee as set out in the Council's pronouncements including Circular SDC 11:4 Vol 4 dated 30 July 2014 and Circular SDC 8:4 Vol 5 dated 29 January 2015 thereby being in breach of Regulation 16 of the Dental Registration Regulations and/or Clause 2 of the Council's Ethical Code and Ethical Guidelines;*

*and that in relation to the facts alleged you have been guilty of professional misconduct and thereby liable under Section 40(1)(d) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76).*

### 2nd Charge

*That you, DR. SNG WEE HOCK over the period 3 April 2015 to 16 May 2015, whilst practising as a dentist at WH Dental Surgeons, whose clinics include those at the Hougang Clinic, the Seletar Clinic and the Punggol Clinic, failed to provide supervision of Dr Park Seunghyun (DCR No. D25468A) ("Dr. Park") who was registered as a dentist with conditional registration under Section 14A of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76), to wit:*

### Particulars

- a. *You were approved by the Council as the fully registered dentist to supervise Dr. Park.*
- b. *You were reminded by the Council on 3 September 2014, 29 January 2015 and 8 April 2015 that you were to supervise any dentists registered with conditional registration under your supervision and that the supervisor must work in the same clinic as the supervisee.*

- c. *Over the period from 3 April 2015 to 16 May 2015 you allowed Dr. Park to work independently from you at the WH Dental Clinics and you failed to supervise Dr. Park.*
- d. *You breached your duties as supervisor of the conditional registered dentists as set out in the Council's pronouncements including Circular SDC 11:4 Vol 4 dated 30 July 2014 and Circular SDC 8:4 Vol 5 dated 29 January 2015 thereby being in breach of Regulation 16 of the Dental Registration Regulations and/or Clause 2 of the Council's Ethical Code and Ethical Guidelines;*

*and that in relation to the facts alleged you have been guilty of professional misconduct and thereby liable under Section 40(1)(d) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76).*

- ii. 2nd Respondent pleaded guilty to the following charge:

*That you, DR JUN SOO LEE over the period 27 October 2014 to 16 May 2015, whilst practising as a dentist at WH Dental Surgeons, whose clinics include those at 1 Hougang Street 91 #01-16/17, Singapore 538692 ("the Hougang clinic"), 33 Sengkang West Avenue #03-34, The Seletar Mall, Singapore 796653 ("the Seletar clinic") and Block 198, Punggol Field #02-01, Singapore 820198 ("the Punggol clinic") (collectively, the "WH Dental Clinics"), failed to work under supervision whilst still under conditional registration, to wit:*

*Particulars*

- a. *You were registered as a dentist with conditional registration under Section 14A(1) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76).*
- b. *Dr. Sng Wee Hock ("Dr. Sng") was approved by the Council as the fully registered dentist to supervise you.*
- c. *Over the period from 27 October 2014 to 16 May 2015 you worked independently and without supervision from Dr. Sng at the WH Dental Clinics.*
- d. *You were reminded by the Council on 4 November 2014, 29 January 2015 and 4 April 2015 that as a dentist registered with conditional registration you were to be*

*supervised by an approved fully registered dentist at work and that the supervisor must work in the same clinic as you.*

- e. *As such, you breached your conditions of conditional registration including Section 14A(4) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76) and/or the Council's pronouncements including Circular SDC 11:4 Vol 4 dated 30 July 2014 and Circular SDC 8:4 Vol 5 dated 29 January 2015 thereby being in breach of Regulation 16 of the Dental Registration Regulations and/or Clause 2 of the Council's Ethical Code and Ethical Guidelines;*

*and that in relation to the facts alleged you have been guilty of professional misconduct and thereby liable under Section 40(1)(d) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76).*

- iii. 3rd Respondent pleaded guilty to the following charge:

*That you, DR PARK SEUNGHYUN over the period 3 April 2015 to 16 May 2015, whilst practising as a dentist at WH Dental Surgeons, whose clinics include those at 1 Hougang Street 91 #01-16/17, Singapore 538692 ("the Hougang clinic"), 33 Sengkang West Avenue #03-34, The Seletar Mall, Singapore 796653 ("the Seletar clinic") and Block 198, Punggol Field #02-01, Singapore 820198 ("the Punggol clinic") (collectively, the "WH Dental Clinics"), you failed to work under supervision whilst still under conditional registration, to wit:*

*Particulars*

- a. *You were registered as a dentist with conditional registration under Section 14A(1) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76).*
- b. *Dr. Sng Wee Hock ("Dr. Sng") was approved by the Council as the fully registered dentist to supervise you.*
- c. *Over the period from 3 April 2015 to 16 May 2015 you worked independently and without supervision from Dr. Sng while working at the WH Dental Clinics.*
- d. *You were reminded by the Council on 9 April 2015 that as a dentist registered with conditional registration you were to be supervised by an approved fully registered dentist at*

*work and that the supervisor must work in the same clinic as you.*

- e. *As such, you breached your conditions of conditional registration including Section 14A(4) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76) and/or the Council's pronouncements including Circular SDC 11:4 Vol 4 dated 30 July 2014 and Circular SDC 8:4 Vol 5 dated 29 January 2015 thereby being in breach of Regulation 16 of the Dental Registration Regulations and/or Clause 2 of the Council's Ethical Code and Ethical Guidelines;*

*and that in relation to the facts alleged you have been guilty of professional misconduct and thereby liable under Section 40(1)(d) of the Dental Registration Act (Cap. 76).*

8. After the 2nd and 3rd Respondents were informed of the complaint on 22 May 2015, they forwarded their replies on 12 June 2015 and 23 June 2015 respectively.
9. On 7 July 2015, SDC wrote a further letter to the 2nd and 3rd Respondents requesting them to submit a written explanation of their breach of the terms of conditional registration and why action should not be taken to cancel their conditional registration pursuant to Section 14A(5)(a) of the Dental Registration Act ("DRA"). They were told to stop work in the meantime.
10. Thereupon, the 1st Respondent and 2nd Respondent responded on 14 July 2015 and 16 July 2015 respectively with their explanations and tendered their apologies for the breaches which they had admittedly committed.
11. In view of the clear and unequivocal acknowledgement of their breaches and unreserved apologies tendered by the 2nd and 3rd Respondents, SDC in their letter of 21 July 2015 addressed to the said two Respondents, informed them that SDC had decided not to cancel their conditional registration. They were permitted to continue with their dental practice subject to the existing terms and conditions of the conditional registration. Further, they were warned that leniency would not be shown should SDC become aware of any future breaches. We were informed by the Defence that both the 2nd and 3rd Respondents believed that the complaint against them was resolved at that time.
12. However, on 16 November 2015, 2nd and 3rd Respondents were informed by SDC that the Complaints Committee ("CC") had

recommended that their case would be reviewed by a Disciplinary Committee (“DC”).

13. Following this, Notices of Inquiry by Disciplinary Committee dated 6 February 2017 were issued to the 3 Respondents which contained the charge/charges against each of them as fully set out in paragraph 7 above.
14. The 2nd and 3rd Respondents through their solicitors made representations to the Prosecution to withdraw the charges against them but was informed on 30 March 2017 that their requests were not acceded to.

### **The Hearing**

15. At the hearing, the Prosecution submitted the following documents:
  - i. Submissions on Sentencing.
  - ii. Agreed Bundle of Documents.
  - iii. Council’s Bundle of Documents and Authorities (CBOD).
16. The Defence submitted the following documents:
  - i. Submissions for Mitigation (For Dr. Sng Wee Hock).
  - ii. Submissions for Mitigation (For Dr. Jun Soo Lee).
  - iii. Submissions for Mitigation (For Dr. Park Seunghyun)
  - iv. Respondents’ Bundle of Authorities (For Submissions for Mitigation)
17. In the Submissions for Mitigation for the 2nd and 3rd Respondents, Defence Counsel Mr. S Selvaraj (“Mr. Selvaraj”) had pointed out that as the 2nd and 3rd Respondents were dealt with by the SDC earlier based on the same complaint and facts as the charges now before us, there was double jeopardy.
18. Mr. Selvaraj was informed by the Legal Assessor that since double jeopardy is a defence in law, the 2nd and 3rd Respondents’ plea of guilt would have to be rejected. He was asked to reconsider his clients’ plea and mitigation.

19. Upon taking instructions, Mr. Selvaraj proceeded to apply to amend the relevant paragraphs in the 2nd and 3rd Respondents' Submissions for Mitigation which in effect withdrew the allegation of double jeopardy. The application was granted and relevant paragraphs of both said Submissions were amended accordingly.
20. The guilty pleas of all 3 Respondents were accepted and they were convicted of the charges preferred against them.
21. We next turn to the Prosecution's Submissions on Sentencing presented by Mr. Thio Shen Yee ("Mr. Thio") the counsel for the SDC. In his Submissions, Mr. Thio had included inter alia the following requests:
  - i. The sentencing of the 2nd and 3rd Respondents be held in abeyance pending the outcome of an action which SDC intends to take under Section 14A(5) read with Section 21 of DRA.
  - ii. When the said DRA 14A(5) process is satisfactorily completed the SDC may not require any sentence against the said 2 Respondents. In such an event, the DC is requested to issue an advisory (not a sentence) for the purpose of conveying what would have been the sentence in this case if Section 14A(5) had not been invoked by SDC. This would be helpful for cases of similar nature in the future.
22. Mr. Thio relies on Section 40(2)(g) which provides that the DC may "*make such order as the Disciplinary Committee thinks fit*" which he submits empowers the DC to issue the orders should it be so minded.
23. The DC through its legal assessor pointed out that:
  - i. Section 40(2)(g) has to be read in the context of all the other sub-sections in Section 40. The ejusdem generis rule applies when an interpretation of Section 40(2)(g) is called into question.
  - ii. The ejusdem generis rule directs that words of wide meaning associated in the text with words of more limited meaning are taken to be restricted by implication to the same limited character (See *Singsung Pte Ltd v LG 26 Electronics Pte Ltd* (2016) 4 SLR 86; (2016) SGCA 33.
  - iii. Section 40(2)(g) does not empower the DC to withhold sentencing and thereafter issue an advisory instead.



24. Consequently, the Prosecution proceeded to address the DC on the appropriate punishment to be imposed on each of the Respondents.

### **Prosecution's Submissions**

25. Prosecution pointed out that the SDC had issued separate Circulars on 30 July 2014, 3 September 2014 (<http://www.healthprofessionals.gov.sg/content/hprof/sdc/en/topnav/announcements/circular-on-supervision-of-dentists-under-conditional-registrati.html>) and 29 January 2015 to all members who are employers stating that some dentists have not been receiving the necessary supervision during their conditional registration period and employers are reminded to ensure that their supervisees are being supervised at work at all times.
26. It was further established that the Respondents received an email from SDC in April 2015 explaining and reminding them of the requirements of supervision of conditional dentists.
27. They were informed that it is a requirement that the supervisee and supervisor should work at the same clinic premises.
28. The Prosecution alleged that investigations revealed that the Respondents had been guilty of the following breaches:
- i. 1st Respondent failed to supervise 2nd Respondent (and 2nd Respondent acted without supervision) for the period 27 October 2014 to 16 May 2015 – a period of about 7 months and about 100 sessions.
  - ii. 1st Respondent failed to supervise 3rd Respondent (and 3rd Respondent acted without supervision) for the period 4 April 2015 to 25 April 2015 – a period of 3 weeks and about 9 sessions.
29. It is the Prosecution's case that the 1st Respondent's aim was to maximise his profits by deploying the 2nd and 3rd Respondents to the different clinic locations of WH Dental.
30. Such breaches are prevalent and are serious because they put the well-being of members of the public at risk.
31. The Prosecution cited 2 authorities for the guidance of the DC:
- i. SDC v Dr. Yap Eng Huat Jimmy & Ms. Lim Jingyi

- a. Ms. Lim Jingyi an Oral Health Therapist (“OHT”) was convicted for misconduct in carrying out an X-ray procedure without Dr. Jimmy Yap’s (“Dr. Yap”) supervision.
  - b. Dr. Yap was fined \$10,000.00 while the OHT was sentenced to suspension of 24 months. It therefore appears that the supervisor was dealt with more leniently than the supervisee OHT.
  - c. It is submitted that Dr. Yap’s case should not be followed as the Prosecution feels that it is wrong to deal with the supervisor more leniently than the supervisee.
- ii. SDC v Dr. Sharifah Nazilah Syed Taha & Tan Chu Fei Patricia
  - a. Dr. Sharifah was charged with failing to supervise Ms. Tan (an OHT) on 4 occasions when the latter carried out acts of dentistry and performed procedures beyond her allowable scope of work.
  - b. Dr. Sharifah was suspended for 3 months and fined \$20,000.00 (\$5,000.00 per incident), censured and ordered to furnish a letter of undertaking not to repeat the same offences.
  - c. Ms. Tan was suspended for 6 months and fined \$8,000.00 (\$3,000.00 per incident), censured and ordered to furnish a letter of undertaking.
32. Dr. Sharifah’s punishment appears to have been lighter than the OHT’s in terms of the period of suspension. However, Dr. Sharifah was at least suspended even though it was for a shorter period than that imposed on the OHT.
33. Prosecution submits that it disagrees with the lighter suspension imposed on Dr. Sharifah but at least both supervisor and supervisee received a suspension.
34. In the case before us, the 3 Respondents were involved in a far wider reaching series of breaches that affected many more patients than in Dr. Sharifah’s case. The 3 Respondents should therefore receive harsher sentences than that of the supervisor and supervisee involved in Dr. Sharifah’s case.

**Dr. Sng's antecedents**

35. Further, the Prosecution pointed out the 1st Respondent has 2 previous convictions recorded against him by the DC for professional misconduct.
- 1) In a Grounds of Decision dated 29 November 2013, he was stated to be facing a charge of misrepresentation to a patient that the cost of the dental implant procedure could be fully claimed from her Medisave Account when this was untrue.
  - 2) It was held that he had been motivated by profit and had not adequately informed the patient before he carried out an extraction for the purpose of an implant.
  - 3) He was fined \$15,000.00, censured, ordered to provide a written undertaking and pay 80% of the costs and expenses of the hearing including costs of SDC and the Legal Assessor.
  - 4) In a subsequent case before another DC as recorded in the Grounds of Decision dated 25 July 2016, he faced 14 charges. He pleaded guilty to 4 charges with 10 charges to be taken into consideration.
    - i. The 4 charges related to delegating 4 dental procedures on 4 occasions to unqualified persons.
    - ii. He was suspended for a period of 15 months and fined \$40,000.00.
    - iii. He was censured and ordered to give a written undertaking that he would not engage in such conduct complained of.
    - iv. He was ordered to pay costs of SDC and the Legal Assessor.
36. According to the Prosecution, the 1st Respondent had appealed to the High Court and his appeal was dismissed. He is currently serving his suspension.
37. The 1st Respondent has shown disregard for the authority and regulations of the SDC. The current charges he faced were not cases of negligence but one of dishonesty and in pursuit of economic gain. He should not be leniently treated.

38. He has acted irresponsibly towards the 2nd and 3rd Respondents who were assigned to be under his care and supervision.
39. By his action, he had knowingly and intentionally endangered the health and care of multiple members of the public.
40. The Prosecution submits that the maximum fine of \$50,000.00 and suspension between 20 – 24 months, a censure and a written undertaking not to engage in similar conduct in the future, should be ordered and imposed against the 1st Respondent.

### **2nd and 3rd Respondents**

41. As regards the 2nd and 3rd Respondents, in view of the circumstances of this case, the Prosecution is of the view that the DC may consider lighter sentences against them be imposed.
42. it was pointed out that normally the SDC would apply for the DC to suspend registered dentists (this included conditionally registered dentists) for similar acts between 12 and 15 months and impose a fine of \$10,000.00 and an order that a written undertaking not to engage in similar conduct in the future be issued.
43. However, the Prosecution does not seek a suspension of the 2nd and 3rd Respondents in this case but would instead invite the DC to consider an alternative mode of punishment be imposed.
44. Prosecution urges the DC to consider ordering the cancelling of the conditional registration of the 2nd and 3rd Respondents instead of a suspension. In this way, it would be open to them to re-apply to the SDC for re-registration without having to wait for 3 months which would have been the minimum period to be imposed if a suspension is ordered against them.
45. Furthermore, the Prosecution seeks all costs and expenses under Section 40(4) and Section 40(7) of the DRA against all the Respondents.

### **Mitigation**

46. Defence Counsel submitted inter alia as follows:
  - 1) All 3 Respondents had decided to plead guilty at the earliest opportunity after having obtained relevant legal advice.

- 2) It is undisputed that no harm was caused to any of the patients involved during the relevant periods stated in the charges.
- 3) The 1st Respondent had enlisted the help of his colleague Dr. Alice Chua, a fully registered Division 1 dentist to help provide guidance to the 2nd and 3rd Respondents when he was unable to do so.
- 4) There was no economic gain. The offences were purely technical in nature.
- 5) There were prevailing doubts among dental professionals and employees on the rules relating to supervision and conditional registered dentists at the material time.
- 6) It was only after attending a talk organised by SDC on 13 October 2015 that the 1st Respondent realized that he had misunderstood the rules in relation to supervision.
- 7) Prior to that the clinic's ex-office manager had clarified with SDC in November 2014 who advised that so long as both supervisor and supervisee are kept in close contact via various means (not necessary in the same room), the rules are satisfied.
- 8) The 1st Respondent has taken steps to ensure that such breaches would not happen again.
- 9) DC is urged to consider imposing a heavy fine with no suspension.
- 10) If the DC is minded to suspend, the suspension should run concurrent with the suspension period imposed on him in the 2016 case which the 1st Respondent is presently undergoing.
- 11) As regards 2nd and 3rd Respondents, they had both ceased practice in July 2015 for a short period when the SDC wrote to them for an explanation. It was only after they were informed on 21 July 2015 they could continue under the same terms and conditions of their conditional registrations that they resumed practice. This could be taken into consideration.
- 12) Both 2nd and 3rd Respondents were newcomers to Singapore during the relevant periods that they were working in WH Dental clinics. They were not familiar with the rules and regulations.

- 13) They had both inadvertently committed the breaches they were charged with.
47. The 2nd Respondent is now working at Medicare Associates & Dental Surgery while the 3rd Respondent has moved to iDental Surgeons Pte Ltd. Both have taken extra care to ensure that they are properly supervised by their supervisors and comply fully with all relevant rules and regulations.
48. Any cancellation of their conditional registration would be too harsh a penalty to impose. The DC is urged to issue a warning to the 2nd and 3rd Respondents instead.

### **Decision**

49. The DC has carefully considered the submissions of the Prosecution and all matters raised in the mitigation raised by the Defence for the Respondents.
50. The DC notes that such breaches were/are prevalent enough for the SDC to issue circulars on 30 July 2014, 3 September 2014 and 29 January 2015 to dental practitioners reminding them that proper supervision should be ensured in the case of conditionally registered dentists at all times. Dentists were advised that the supervisor and the supervisee had to work in the same clinic premises.
51. In addition to the circulars, all 3 Respondents admitted receiving personal emails in April 2015 specifically reminding them of the requirements of supervision of conditionally registered dentists.
52. We note on the charges as submitted that the 1st Respondent had failed to supervise:
- i. The 2nd Respondent over a period from 27 October 2014 to 16 May 2015 (about 7 months and about 100 sessions).
  - ii. The 3rd Respondent over a period from 4 April 2015 to 25 April 2015 (about 3 weeks and about 9 sessions).
53. The 1st Respondent however, did explain that there could be less than 100 sessions in the case of the 2nd Respondent, as there were some “no show” patients in the recorded appointments. We do not however consider the difference as highly significant as the number of sessions left would still be a large number and Defence has not been able to give any indication how many “no shows” had taken place. Besides they

had agreed that there would have been some walk-ins that were unrecorded.

54. While it can be said that no harm had been caused to the patients treated by the 2nd and 3rd Respondents, we do not accept that the conduct of the Respondents were any less serious because of that.
55. The DC is mindful that a strong message ought to be sent out to registered dentists that such conduct would not be tolerated and that the high standards set should not be compromised under any circumstances.
56. The DC is satisfied that the 1st Respondent was driven by profits when he allowed the 2nd and 3rd Respondents to carry out their work without supervision.
57. In the circumstances, we accept the Prosecution's submission that in view of the 1st Respondent's previous convictions, the maximum fine of \$50,000.00 should be levied and an appropriate period of suspension be imposed on him.
58. We do not agree with the Prosecution that the DC should order the cancellation of the 2nd and 3rd Respondents conditional registration instead of imposing a suspension on them.
59. We are of the view that cancelling a conditional registration in effect amounts to a removal of the dentist name from the appropriate register and that it should only be ordered when the most severe sentence that can be imposed on an offender is required in the circumstances of the case.
60. Such orders are not to be taken lightly or used as a way to enable the 2nd and 3rd Respondents with the concurrence of the SDC to resume practice earlier than if a suspension (with a minimum period set as 3 months) had been imposed.
61. We will however consider a lighter sentence for the 2nd and 3rd Respondents in the circumstances of the present case. However, it still has to be properly considered in the light of the facts adduced, the authorities cited and the points raised in their mitigation.
62. We note that 2nd Respondent had committed the offence for a much longer period involving more sessions than the 3rd Respondent.

63. Taking into consideration all the circumstances of the case, the DC hereby order as follows:

1st Respondent

- i. The 1st Respondent be suspended for a period of:
  - a. 15 months on the 1st charge.
  - b. 4 months on the 2nd charge.
- ii. Both suspensions to run concurrently immediately after the 1st Respondent's current suspension ordered in DC 2014/01.
- iii. A fine of \$50,000.00 be paid by the 1st Respondent.
- iv. The 1st Respondent be censured.
- v. The 1st Respondent gives a written undertaking to SDC that he will not engage in the conduct complained of.
- vi. The 1st Respondent pays 90% of the costs and expenses of and incidental to these proceedings including costs of counsel to the SDC and the Legal Assessor

2nd Respondent

- i. The 2nd Respondent be suspended for a period of 3 months.
- ii. A fine of \$8,000.00 be paid by the 2nd Respondent.
- iii. The 2nd Respondent be censured.
- iv. The 2nd Respondent gives a written undertaking to SDC that he will not engage in the conduct complained of.
- v. The 2nd Respondent pays 8% of the costs and expenses of and incidental to these proceedings including costs of counsel to SDC and the Legal Assessor.

3rd Respondent

- i. The 3rd Respondent be suspended for a period of 3 months.



- ii. A fine of \$2,000.00 be paid by the 3rd Respondent.
  - iii. The 3rd Respondent be censured.
  - iv. The 3rd Respondent gives a written undertaking to SDC that he will not engage in the conduct complained of.
  - v. The 3rd Respondent pays 2% of the costs and expenses of and incidental to these proceedings including costs of counsel to SDC and the Legal Assessor.
64. It is hereby ordered pursuant to Regulation 25 of the Dental Registration Regulations that the grounds of our decision be published for the benefit of the public.
65. The hearing is hereby concluded.

Dated 29 August 2017.

DR HWANG YEE CHEAU  
Chairman, Disciplinary Committee

DR CHAN SIEW LUEN  
Member, Disciplinary Committee

DR ONG KHENG KOK  
Member, Disciplinary Committee