

**PUBLIC HEARING****Professional Conduct Committee  
Review Hearing****17 July 2025****Name:** STAMOULIS, Athanasios**Registration number:** 80390**Case number:** CAS-205058

---

**General Dental Council:** Christopher Sykes, counsel  
Instructed by Carla Marie Clough, IHLPS**Registrant:** Not present  
Not represented

---

**Fitness to practise:** Impaired by reason of misconduct**Outcome:** Suspension extended (with a review)**Duration:** Nine months

---

**Committee members:** Andy Skelton (Lay) (Chair)  
Laura Owen (Dental Care Professional)  
Alison Mayell (Dentist)**Legal adviser:** Nicola Gordelier**Committee Secretary:** Gareth Llewellyn

- 
1. This is a resumed hearing of the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). The hearing is being conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams in line with the Dental Professionals Hearings Service's current practice. Mr Stamoulis is not present and is not represented in his absence. Christopher Sykes of counsel, instructed by Carla Marie Clough of the GDC's In-House Legal Presentation Service, appears for the GDC.

**Purpose of hearing**

2. The purpose of today's hearing is to review a substantive direction of suspension imposed on Mr Stamoulis's registration by the PCC in June 2024. The hearing is being held in accordance with section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').

**Format of hearing**

3. This case, bearing reference number CAS-205058, is being considered at the same hearing as another, separate case which has also given rise to a substantive direction of suspension for Mr Stamoulis. That case bears the reference number CAS-193787. Separate consideration has been given to each case, and separate determinations have been produced. This determination relates solely to the case bearing the reference number CAS-205058. This case has been referred to as 'the second case' at today's hearing.

**Service of notice of hearing**

4. The Committee first considered whether service has been properly effected in accordance with the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules').
5. Mr Sykes on behalf of the GDC submitted that Mr Stamoulis has been properly notified of today's hearing in accordance with Rule 28 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). The Committee noted that a notice of hearing was sent to Mr Stamoulis's registered address on 10 June 2025 using the Royal Mail's Special Delivery postal service. The Royal Mail's Track and Trace service records that the notice was delivered on the morning of 11 June 2025. The notice set out the date, time and venue of the hearing, as well as confirming the nature of the hearing and the powers available to the Committee. The notice also stated that the Committee may decide to proceed in Mr Stamoulis's absence. Copies of the notice were also sent to Mr Stamoulis by first class post and email.
6. The Committee accepted the advice provided by the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. Having regard to the GDC's submissions and the evidence placed before it the Committee was satisfied that service has been properly effected in accordance with the Rules.

**Proceeding in absence**

7. The Committee then went on to consider whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in the absence of Mr Stamoulis in accordance with Rule 54 of the Rules. It was mindful that the discretion to proceed in the absence of a registrant must be exercised with the utmost care and caution. It heard that Mr Sykes on behalf of the GDC invites the Committee to proceed in the absence of Mr Stamoulis.

8. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard. The Committee had regard to an email from Mr Stamoulis of 23 April 2025 in which he stated that he intends to attend the review hearing. The Committee recognises that this email was received prior to the notice of hearing referred to above being sent to him. The Committee heard from the Committee Secretary that attempts were made to contact Mr Stamoulis by email and telephone, including on the morning of the hearing, given that Mr Stamoulis had not attended at the scheduled time. Mr Stamoulis was informed that, unless he contacted the Hearings service, the Committee may decide to proceed in his absence.
9. The Committee determined that it would be fair and appropriate to proceed in the absence of Mr Stamoulis. It determined that Mr Stamoulis has voluntarily absented himself, and that any prejudice caused to him is limited by the fact that he has provided written information for the Committee's consideration and is outweighed by the need to review the suspension expeditiously. The Committee noted that Mr Stamoulis had previously stated that he would be in attendance at today's hearing, but it considered that the GDC and the Hearings service have made every effort to facilitate his attendance. The Committee considered that an adjournment, which has not been requested, would be unlikely to secure Mr Stamoulis's attendance. The Committee was also mindful of the public interest in the expeditious consideration of the case, and of the imminent expiry of the direction of suspension to which Mr Stamoulis's name is subject.

### **Existing order**

10. In June 2024 the PCC held a hearing of inquiry in relation to allegations about Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise. The Committee heard, and found proved, allegations relating to the standard of care and treatment of a patient, who was referred to for the purposes of those proceedings as Patient A, in April 2022. That Committee's findings of fact and misconduct may be summarised as follows, as addressed to Mr Stamoulis:

*"...[The Committee] was of the view that the failings in this case are serious and the Committee concluded that Mr Stamoulis' conduct was a significant departure from the standards expected of a registered dental professional. In considering the gravity of Mr Stamoulis' departures from the GDC's Standards, the Committee took into account the opinion of the expert witness in this case, Mr Bateman for the GDC. Mr Bateman opined that Patient A had a high caries risk and active caries. There was a strong risk of caries progression leading to pain and potentially loss of teeth as well as new carious lesions going undetected. Mr Bateman was of the view that Mr Stamoulis had failed to provide all treatment options, discuss the risks and benefits, treat Patient A's UL8 and LL7 and failed to take bitewing radiographs as clinically indicated fell far below the standard expected of a competent Registrant.*

*The Committee noted that the factual findings in this case included clinical failings by Mr Stamoulis in relation to one patient during one appointment. It accepted the opinion evidence of Mr Bateman and considered that these failings concern fundamental aspects of dentistry and directly impacted upon the overarching issue of patient safety and that Mr Stamoulis' failures fell far below the standards. The Committee was satisfied that the failures concern basic and fundamental obligations of a competent dentist and it was of the view that the findings amount to misconduct."*

11. That Committee went on to determine that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of his misconduct. In reaching this finding the Committee determined that Mr Stamoulis had not provided any evidence of his insight into, or remediation, of his misconduct. As well as determining that Mr Stamoulis posed a risk to the public, the

Committee also determined that a finding of impairment was also required in the wider public interest. The Committee determined that the appropriate sanction was one of suspension for a period of six months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration.

12. The PCC reviewed the direction of suspension at a hearing that took place on 18 December 2024. That reviewing Committee determined that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise remained impaired with regard to both public protection and wider public interest considerations, and that it would be appropriate to extend the period of suspended registration by seven months, again with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that extended period of suspended registration. In so doing the PCC suggested that a future reviewing Committee may be assisted by, as addressed to Mr Stamoulis:

- *'evidence of Mr Stamoulis' meaningful engagement with the GDC;*
- *evidence of CPD and training relevant to the clinical risks identified; and*
- *a reflective piece demonstrating Mr Stamoulis' insight and understanding of the impact of his misconduct upon Patient A and the wider public in the dental profession.'*

13. It falls to this Committee to review the extant suspension.

### **Evidence**

14. The Committee has been provided with documentary evidence relevant to its review, including the determinations of the previous PCCs. The Committee has also considered the documents sent by Mr Stamoulis primarily in relation to his other case, namely CAS-193787, insofar as they are relevant to this case, namely CAS-205058. These documents include a reflective statement, a personal development plan (PDP), and a plan for continuing professional development (CPD) courses.

### **Summary of submissions**

15. Mr Sykes on behalf of the GDC submitted that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise remains impaired, and that it would be appropriate to extend the current period of suspended registration by six months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of extended suspension. Mr Sykes also invited the Committee to apply the same sanction to the other case relating to Mr Stamoulis as referred to above, so that that case can again be considered at the same further review hearing in around six months' time.

### **Committee's determination**

16. The Committee has carefully considered all the information presented to it, including the oral submissions of Mr Sykes on behalf of the GDC and the correspondence and information provided by Mr Stamoulis.
17. In its deliberations the Committee has had regard to the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committees, including Indicative Sanctions Guidance* (October 2016, updated December 2020). The Committee has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

### **Impairment**

18. The Committee has determined that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise remains impaired.

19. The Committee has taken account of the documentation submitted by Mr Stamoulis as referred to above. The Committee considers that this information does not demonstrate that Mr Stamoulis has sufficiently remedied his misconduct. The Committee notes that the information provided by Mr Stamoulis about his CPD consists of a plan of what he intends to do, rather than evidence of what he has done, and that his PDP does not address the shortcomings identified by the initial PCC. The Committee also considers that this and other information relating to remediation is not sufficiently focussed on the specific areas of concern. The Committee also notes that Mr Stamoulis's reflective statement does not appear to deal at all with this particular case and is not relevant to the findings made by the previous Committees in this case. In light of Mr Stamoulis's lack of insight, and the shortcomings in his remediation, the Committee finds that Mr Stamoulis continues to pose a risk to the public, and that his fitness to practise remains currently impaired.
20. The Committee also considers that a finding of impairment is also, and again, required in the wider public interest in order to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession. The Committee considers that such public interest considerations would be seriously undermined if no finding were made.

### **Sanction**

21. The Committee next considered whether it would be appropriate to revoke the suspension, or to replace the suspension with a direction of conditional registration.
22. The Committee considered that, given the findings of this and previous Committees, revoking the suspension would place the public and the wider public interest at real risk of harm.
23. The Committee also considered that replacing the existing suspension with a direction of conditions would not be appropriate, and would be insufficient to protect the public and the wider public interest. The Committee is mindful that Mr Stamoulis is not present at this hearing, and indeed did not attend either the initial PCC hearing or the first review hearing. Therefore, due to his lack of meaningful engagement, insight and remediation, the Committee was not able to identify workable conditions with which it could be satisfied that Mr Stamoulis would comply.
24. The Committee then went on to consider whether to extend the current direction of suspension. The Committee determined that a further period of suspended registration is the appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose, and that any lesser sanction would be insufficient to safeguard the public and the public interest. The Committee has determined to extend the period of suspension by nine months, with a review hearing to take place prior to the end of that period of suspended registration. The Committee considers that this period of time is likely to be needed by Mr Stamoulis to develop and demonstrate his insight into and remediation of his misconduct.
25. Although this Committee in no way wishes to bind or fetter the Committee which will review the suspension, it considers that the reviewing Committee may be assisted by Mr Stamoulis providing the following:
  - His attendance at the review hearing;
  - A focused, concise and personal reflective statement which demonstrates that Mr Stamoulis has a full understanding of the impact his actions have had on Patient A and on public confidence in the profession, and how he intends to change his practice in the future to prevent any repetition of the concerns;

- An updated and detailed PDP addressing the areas of concern which led to the finding of misconduct, including but not limited to radiographic practice, diagnosis and treatment of caries, and provision of risks, benefits and treatment options.
  - Evidence of completion of targeted CPD relevant to the issues referred to above; and
  - Evidence of having kept his clinical knowledge and skills up-to-date.
26. The Committee hereby directs that Mr Stamoulis's suspension be extended by nine months, with a review. In so doing the Committee directs that this case be reviewed alongside the other case relating to Mr Stamoulis at the same review hearing. For the avoidance of doubt, the Committee has determined that the period of nine months is appropriate and proportionate, and has put any administrative conveniences out of its mind.

**Right of appeal**

27. Mr Stamoulis will have 28 days from the date on which notice of this decision is deemed to have been served on him to appeal against this decision. Should he decide to appeal, the existing direction of suspension will remain in force until the resolution of any such appeal. Should he decide not to appeal, the current suspension will take effect on the date on which it would otherwise expire.
28. That concludes this case for today.