ON PAPERS

Registration Appeals Committee

Continuing profession development (CPD) appeal meeting

7 August 2025

Name:	HSUEH, Yu Chang
Registration number:	300465
Case reference:	CAS-211191

General Dental Council:	Megan Wolliner, ILAS (not present)
Registrant:	Not present and not represented

Outcome:	Appeal dismissed

Committee members:	Susan Stevens (Dentist) (Chair) Karen Suarez (Dental Care Professional) Miranda Carruthers-Watt (Lay)
Legal Adviser:	Justin Gau
Committee Secretary:	Gareth Llewellyn

1. This is an appeal meeting before the Registration Appeals Committee (RAC). The appeal is against the decision of the Registrar of the General Dental Council (GDC) to erase Mr Hsueh's name from the register for apparent non-compliance with his statutory Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements. The meeting is being held in accordance with the General Dental Council (Registration Appeals) Rules Order of Council 2006 ('the Registration Appeal Rules'), pursuant to Schedule 2A of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

2. Neither party was present at today's meeting following notification from the GDC that the appeal was to be conducted on the papers. The meeting was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current practice.

Preliminary matters

Decision to conduct the appeal in the absence of Mr Hsueh on the papers

3. Neither party was present at today's meeting. The Committee noted that conducting the appeal on the papers is the default position of the GDC unless an appellant requests an oral hearing. Having considered the documents provided, the Committee was satisfied that Mr Hsueh had made no such request.

4. The Committee noted that notification of this appeal meeting was sent to Mr Hsueh by International Track and Signed post and secure email on 1 July 2025 in accordance with Rule 5 (2) of the Registration Appeal Rules.

5. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee was satisfied that it was appropriate to consider today's appeal in the absence of either party and on the papers.

Decision and reasons on the appeal

Background

6. The General Dental Council (Continuing Professional Development) (Dentists and Dental Care Professionals) Rules 2017 ('the CPD Rules') set out the CPD requirements placed on registrants as of 1 August 2018, and the steps that the GDC shall take in respect of registrants' compliance and non-compliance with those requirements.

7. The CPD Rules came into force on the 1 January 2018 and took effect in respect of dentists on that same day.

8. In accordance with Rule 1, a 'CPD cycle' means, in respect of a dentist, a period of five years beginning on 1 January following the date the dentist is first registered and each subsequent period of five years. A 'CPD year' means, in respect of a dentist, a period of 12 months beginning on 1 January in any calendar year.

Summary

9. Mr Hsueh first registered with the GDC as a dentist on 11 May 2022. His CPD cycle, which provides the context of this appeal, began on 1 January 2023 and is due to end

on 31 December 2027. The specific period of time relevant to this appeal is the two-year CPD period of 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024. Towards the end of that period the GDC sent correspondence on a number of occasions to remind Mr Hsueh that, amongst other requirements, he needed to provide his annual CPD statement and needed to declare at least 10 hours' worth of verifiable CPD for every two consecutive CPD years. Further reminders followed.

10. On 30 December 2024 the GDC received an annual declaration from Mr Hsueh of zero hours' worth of CPD for 2024. The GDC then wrote to Mr Hsueh to inform him that he had not declared sufficient hours to meet the minimum requirement of 10 hours' worth of verifiable CPD over two consecutive years, namely 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024. Further correspondence, and information from Mr Hsueh, then followed, with Mr Hsueh stating in particular that he did not undertake any CDP in 2023 and 2024 as he thought that he only had to complete the 100-hour requirement in a five-year cycle. The GDC wrote to Mr Hsueh on 4 April 2025 to inform him that the Registrar had decided to remove his name from the register as he had not provided a compliant CPD record demonstrating that he had met the minimum requirement of 10 hours' worth of CPD over the two-year CPD period of 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024.

11. On 2 May 2025 the GDC received Mr Hsueh's appeal against the Registrar's decision. In his letter of appeal Mr Hsueh stated that, after registering with the GDC in 2023 he continued to work in Taiwan, and later, in 2023, began applying to join the NHS performers' list, the results of which he was awaiting, with a view to working in the UK. Mr Hsueh stated that he had not been aware of the requirement that he complete 10 hours' worth of verifiable CPD for the two-year CPD period of 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024 until he was contacted by the GDC as referred to above. Mr Hsueh stated that he has undertaken CPD in 2025, and that he is now fully aware of, and will comply with, the CPD requirements of his registration in the future.

12. The further information that Mr Hsueh provided in support of his appeal was assessed by the GDC, with its conclusion remaining that Mr Hsueh had not provided sufficient evidence of him having completed a minimum of 10 hours' worth of verifiable CPD for the two-year consecutive CPD period in question.

Summary of submissions

13. In its written submissions, the GDC submitted that, as set out above, Mr Hsueh has not complied with the CPD requirements of his registration, as he has not demonstrated that he has undertaken a minimum of 10 hours' worth of verifiable CPD in the two-year period of 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024 despite a number of reminders being sent to him in that regard. The GDC submits that Mr Hsueh has had sufficient opportunities to do so, and that he should have been aware of, and should have complied with, the ongoing CPD requirements of his registration.

14. Mr Hsueh's representations in support of his appeal are referred to above. Mr Hsueh also provided details of a position of employment that he has been offered in the UK.

Committee's decision

15. The Committee had regard to the documentary evidence provided today. It took account of the written submissions made by the GDC and those made by Mr Hsueh. The

Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

16. The Committee has determined to dismiss Mr Hsueh's appeal against the decision of the Registrar to remove his name from the Register. The Committee finds that Mr Hsueh has not complied with his CPD requirements, and that there is no information to suggest that there are any mitigating circumstances which might mean that a decision other than dismissing his appeal would be appropriate. The Committee considers that Mr Hsueh had ample opportunity to comply with his CPD requirements, and was given a considerable number of reminders in respect of those obligations. The Committee considers that, as a registrant, Mr Hsueh is under a duty to be aware of, and meet, the ongoing requirements of his registration. Having failed to do so, the Committee considers that the appropriate course of action is to dismiss his appeal.

17. Unless Mr Hsueh exercises his right of appeal pursuant to paragraph 6 of Schedule 2A to the Act, the erasure decision will take effect upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period. It will then be open to Mr Hsueh to apply for the restoration of his name if he meets the CPD and other requirements for restoration.

18. That concludes this determination.