

PUBLIC HEARING**Registration Appeals Committee
(Registration Appeal Hearing)****24 July 2026****Name:** REXHVELAJ, KLARISA**Case number:** CAS-214440-V9D6X6

General Dental Council: Ms Rebecca Vanstone, Counsel
Instructed by Lowri Hopkins, ILAS**Registrant:** Present and unrepresented

Outcome: Appeal dismissed

Committee members: Helen Wagner (Chair, Lay Member)
Estelle Williams (Dentist Member)
Emma Haywood (DCP Member)**Legal Adviser:** Nicola Bircher**Committee Secretary:** Jamie Barge

Miss Rexhvela

1. This is a Registration Appeals Committee hearing. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.
2. The hearing is being held in accordance with the terms of the *General Dental Council (Registration Appeals) Rules Order of Council 2006*, pursuant to Schedule 4A of the *Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)* ('the Dentists Act').
3. The purpose of this hearing has been for the Committee to consider your appeal against the decision of the GDC's Registrar that you are not eligible for registration on the Dentists Register ('the Register') as a Dentist on the basis that you are not of good character and have not demonstrated that you possess the necessary knowledge of English.
4. You are representing yourself at these proceedings. Ms Vanstone Counsel, appears on behalf of the Registrar.

Legal framework and background

5. The Committee had regard to the legal framework and factual background to this appeal, as set out in the written case summary provided by the GDC dated 8 July 2026, and as outlined by Ms Vanstone in her opening submissions.

Application to join ORE candidate list

6. You submitted an application to join the ORE candidate list which was received by the Council on 3 November 2025. As part of the Council's assessment process in relation to English language evidence, it uses an IELTS online verification service where an applicant has submitted an IELTS test report. This enables the Council to input the test report form number (24AL500163REXK001A) to cross reference this against the certificate, and verify the results provided.
7. On 20 November 2025, the Council's Registration team received an email from the British Council's IELTS Verification Team stating: *After careful review and consideration of IELTS databases, we can confirm the Test Report Form you have provided for this case does not match our records. This is a counterfeit TRF and should be disregarded. Accordingly, we will now cancel these results in line with the IELTS policy and the test taker will receive a 5-year ban.*
8. The Council responded to the IELTS representative on 20 November 2025, seeking confirmation of the true results as recorded in the IELTS database, as these have been cancelled and could no longer be accessed by the Council. The British Council's IELTS Verification Team responded on the same date, stating: *I'm afraid we are unable to provide the test taker's original scores. In line with the IELTS Terms and Conditions and global test security policy, once a Test Report Form is cancelled or withdrawn due to irregularities or tampering, the associated results are classified as withheld and cannot be released. This policy ensures the integrity and security of the IELTS test and applies globally.."*
9. Following the email from IELTS, on 27 November 2025 the Council wrote to you informing you that your IELTS certificate has been identified as counterfeit by IELTS during the verification process. The Council required you to provide an explanation as to how this happened, and why the results recorded by IELTS were inconsistent with those showing in your Test Report Certificate.
10. On 02 December 2025, the Council received an email from you providing an explanation as to how the IELTS certificate was fraudulent. You stated the following:

- In early 2024, you took the IELTS examination in Albania as part of your university application. Your university application was handled through a third-party agency. Due to this you cannot access your IELTS online account and do not have your original IELTS certificate. You have been unable to return to Albania due to waiting for your new visa, therefore you asked your family to send you all the necessary documents. The IELTS certificate sent from your family in Albania was submitted in good faith and you assumed it to be correct and genuine.
- You sincerely apologised for any misunderstanding and had contacted the agency to request clarification regarding the discrepancy.
- You provided additional documents to demonstrate your English proficiency and your integrity, professional values and commitment to honesty.

Assessment

11. Following consideration of your application and clarification email of 02 December 2025, the Council declined the Application for the ORE as you had not satisfied the registrar that you had the necessary knowledge of English and were of good character.
12. 02 January 2026, the Council wrote to you via letter. In the letter, the Council set out that the Application was refused “...because your IELTS test results are not authentic. You have failed to meet the required standard set by the GDC and your evidence is otherwise insufficient to demonstrate the necessary knowledge of English.”
13. The Council also set out your right of appeal, and that any appeal must be submitted within 28 days of the date of the letter (being no later than 30 January 2026).

Your appeal

14. On 19 January 2026, the Council received a NOA (“Notice of Appeal”) from you in respect of the Registrar’s decision.
15. Within the NOA, you stated the following;
 - You believed that the Council’s decision is based on inaccuracies, misunderstandings of your evidence, and an unfair assessment of your character.
 - You submitted that the Council’s decision contains a factual error regarding your IELTS date which the Council incorrectly recorded as February instead of the correct date in May 2024.
 - You submitted that you did not know the IELTS Certificate to be fraudulent at the time of submitting the Application.
 - In April 2024 you relied in good faith on an external agency in Albania which represented itself as a legitimate agency and competent to assist with IELTS registration and UK study applications.
 - You submitted that you had no reason to suspect that the documentation provided was false, and states that you submitted the same documentation with a UK university application without issue.
 - You accepted that the IELTS certificate is false, and it was later discovered that the agency had supplied a false certificate without your knowledge and consent.
 - You stated that upon becoming aware of the issue with the fraudulent certificate, you acted immediately and cooperated fully with the Council.

- You are particularly concerned by the Council's conclusion that you are not of good character which has deeply affected you personally and professionally. You further stated that:
 - You disclosed all relevant information honestly when concerns were raised.
 - You provided explanations and evidence promptly and transparently.
 - You have no history of misconduct, dishonesty or disciplinary findings.
 - The circumstances arose from reliance on a third party, not deliberate wrongdoing.
- In your submission, you stated the submission of the IELTS certificate was an honest mistake and you were victimized by an unethical agency and this should not be equated with a lack of integrity.
- You highlighted that the GDC's assessment letter contained a factual inaccuracy about the date of which the IELTS sitting was completed. The Outcome Letter refers to the test being completed on 17 February 2024, and submitted this may have unfairly affected the assessment of the application. You also confirmed that the test you took was on 10 May 2024.

You provided the following documents along with your NOA:

- IELTS certificate and correspondence with GDC, annotated
- Copy of outcome letter
- Further submissions on English language
- University of Greenwich Master of Science certificate
- Full academic transcript
- Knowledge of English reference
- Further submission on character
- International conference certificates
- LinkedIn screenshots
- Aptis candidate report

Preliminary Matter

16. At the outset of the hearing Ms Vanstone made an application for the matters relating to your health and personal life to be held in private.
17. You explained that you agreed with the application.
18. The panel accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
19. Having been made aware that there may be discussion of health and other personal matters the Committee agreed that those parts of the hearing should be held in private.

Today's appeal hearing

20. The Committee heard oral evidence from you, as well as submissions from Ms Vanstone and yourself.
21. Ms Vanstone opened the GDC's case and provided a background to your appeal application today. She submitted that in order to be eligible for registration, it is a requirement under section 15(3)(b) of the Act, that the Registrar be satisfied that you are of good character. Ms Vanstone

submitted that the onus is on you the appellant to submit true and honest documents. She submitted you have failed to demonstrate that you are of good character as you acted in a dishonest manner by submitting to the Council a counterfeit IELTS certificate.

22. She then stated that as you are intending to give oral evidence under oath, she will hold on to making final submissions until after you have concluded your oral evidence.

Your oral evidence

23. You gave a background to your ORE application in November 2025. You have been in the UK since September 2024 and want to practise in this Country as a Dentist. You stated during the application you found it difficult to find an Albanian translator. You stated you found an agency in Albania to help you with the process. You stated there must have been a misunderstanding of your evidence, and an unfair assessment of your character. In particular, the Council's decision contains a factual error regarding your IELTS date which the GDC incorrectly recorded as February instead of the correct date in May 2024. You submitted you have never taken an examination in February 2024. You sent all relevant documentation to the GDC in support of your good character. You stated this misunderstanding has caused you to feel uncomfortable. You accept the requirement to take another IELTS examination, but you are concerned about the accusation of you being of a bad character. You submitted that you genuinely did not know the IELTS Certificate to be fraudulent at the time of submitting your application.

24. During cross examination from Ms Vanstone, you stated that you used an agency in Albania for the purposes of completing the IELTS examination. You provided details of the process and gave reasons why you could not access your on-line account. You stated that after the examination you were given a printed version of the results. A copy was also sent to your on-line account. You stated you sent someone to collect the printed version from the test center. You stated that you never had sight of these test results as you were only required to score 5.5 for entry to a UK University and knew that you had that level of English. You stated that when you were contacted by the GDC regarding the authenticity of your certificate, you contacted the agency for an explanation, but they never got back to you. You stated you sent your parents to the agency to obtain an explanation, but they just said they used what was on file. You stated you had emailed the agency but had not included that email in your appeal documentation.

25. There were no questions from the Committee.

Closing submissions made by the parties

26. Following your oral evidence, the Committee heard closing submissions from Ms Vanstone and yourself.

27. Ms Vanstone submitted that the onus is on you when making an application to ensure that your documents were true and correct. The submission of a counterfeit certificate is a serious matter. The GDC acknowledges your submission about the IELTS date referred to in the Council's letter dated 02 January 2026. While it is regrettable that there is clearly an error, the date was not substantive in the assessment of the application, as the fundamental issue was the IELTS results recorded on the submitted certificate were not consistent with the IELTS Verified records. She submitted that you described the process you used when making online University applications to the UK, and this was the usual process. Ms Vanstone submitted that there are two points to note. First, the fraudulent certificate contained the genuine test results and reference number, and it is highly unlikely that any third party producing a counterfeit certificate would use the correct number. Secondly, the scores required by the University of Greenwich are 5.5, however scores required by the GDC are a minimum 6.5 for any module. Ms Vanstone submitted the fact that the test results

may have been used to gain entry to a UK University does not take this Committee anywhere, because admission would have been granted with a much lower score.

28. Ms Vanstone submitted that your oral evidence is not credible. You stated that you were never aware of your test results, and that you did not collect the results yourself. You had stated you simply assumed you had passed with the required scores and sent one email to the agency of clarification of the certificate but did not receive a response. To date, you have not produced that email. Ms Vanstone submitted, therefore, you have not provided an adequate explanation to demonstrate that you have the requisite good character.

29. Ms Vanstone submitted that if the Committee agrees with her submission in respect of good character, your appeal should be dismissed. However, if the Committee upholds your appeal in relation to the good character ground, it is submitted that the matter ought to be remitted back to the Registrar for the assessment of your English language evidence.

30. You stated that your main concern is clarifying your good character and that there are cultural differences between the GDC and Albania. You assumed you had the correct score, and with regard to the date of the test, you have never done a test in February 2024.

The Committee's decision on your appeal

31. The Committee took account of the submissions made by Ms Vanstone and your submissions. It accepted the advice of the independent Legal Adviser present at these proceedings.

32. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it. No further documentary evidence has been provided.

33. The Committee bore in mind that the burden was on you to satisfy it that you are of good character as required by section 17 of the Dentists Act for registration as a Dentist. When considering your appeal, the Committee had sight of the test for dishonesty and the PSA guidance on good character. The Committee was satisfied that, based on all the information before it, your actions in submitting a fraudulent certificate for registration onto the GDC Register were dishonest.

34. The Committee was aware that the integrity of the register is paramount, and that there is a need to ensure that those who are granted registration are deemed to be of good character.

35. The Committee notes that in respect of the date of the examination, the GDC have acknowledged that the IELTS date referred to in the Council's letter dated 02 January 2026 was incorrect. It contained a date of 17 February 2024, when in fact you completed the test on 10 May 2024. The Committee notes that although this was a mistake on the part of the GDC, this error was not determinative in its assessment of your application. The Committee accepts that the GDC made an error in their letter, but that error was not contained when the GDC asked the British Council for authenticity of the test results. The issue for the Committee to determine upon, is the actual IELTS results recorded on the submitted certificate, which were not consistent with the IELTS Verified records.

36. The Committee went on to consider the issue of your good character. It took into account your written and oral evidence and is not satisfied that you have provided an adequate explanation for why you submitted a fraudulent IELTS certificate. It noted that during questions from Ms Vanstone, your answers were vague, evasive, and lacked detail, particularly with regard to the name of the agency you used in Albania and why you did not have and apparently never seen your original results. In addition, you failed to provide evidence that you had contacted the third party or managed to obtain the original test results. It notes your oral evidence was contradictory, as you initially stated

that you had the online results, but later in cross examination you stated otherwise. In addition, the Committee was concerned when you stated that you only need a score of 5.5 for the University of Greenwich, which is a lower standard than that of the GDC which is a minimum score of 6.5. To date you are not able to provide the original certificate either online or a hard copy. The Committee is satisfied that you have failed to provide a plausible explanation as to why a fraudulent certificate was submitted. The Committee is satisfied that you have failed to produce any evidence to counteract the argument that the GDCs is advancing that the certificate is fraudulent and you knew of this.

37. The Committee therefore considers that during the process of your ORE application, you were dishonest in submitting a counterfeit certificate to the GDC. The Committee is satisfied that the consequence of your dishonest conduct has the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession, as patients and the public have the right to trust that their dentists have properly met the standards required for registration. Further, the Committee could not be satisfied that you would not act in a similar manner if faced with another situation, given the conflicting evidence you gave at this appeal hearing.

38. For all these reasons, the Committee was not satisfied that you have provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that you are of good character as required for registration.

39. Therefore, the Committee has determined to dismiss your appeal.

40. That concludes this hearing.