

ON PAPERS

Registration Appeals Committee (CPD Appeal)

24 March 2026

Name: RYGIELSKA, Natalia

Registration number: 285931

Case number: CAS-213485-Z9F3S8

General Dental Council: Jack Chaffey, ILAS

Registrant: Unrepresented

Outcome: Appeal dismissed

Committee members: Val Evans (Chair, Lay member)
Katherine Barrett (DCP member)
Gulshana Choudhury (Dentist member)

Legal adviser: Claire Robinson

Committee Secretary: Sarah Crewe

1. This was an appeal hearing before the Registration Appeals Committee (RAC). The hearing was conducted remotely on Microsoft Teams.
2. The appeal was against the decision of the Registrar of the General Dental Council (the Council) to erase Miss Rygielska from the Register for apparent non-compliance with the statutory Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements. The hearing was held in accordance with the terms of the General Dental Council (Registration Appeals) Rules Order of Council 2006 ('the Registration Appeal Rules'), pursuant to Schedule 4A of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act').
3. Neither party was present at today's hearing. The Committee first considered the issues of service and whether to proceed with the hearing on the papers in the absence of Miss Rygielska and any representatives for either party. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on both of these matters.

Decision to conduct the appeal in the absence of Miss Rygielska and on the papers

4. Notification of this appeal was sent to Miss Rygielska by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 20 February 2026 in accordance with Rule 5 of the Registration Appeal Rules.
5. The Committee noted that conducting the appeal on the papers is the default position of the GDC unless an appellant requests an oral hearing. It took into account that the GDC's acknowledgement of Miss Rygielska's appeal, dated 21 November 2025, informed Miss Rygielska that she could request an oral hearing within 28 days of the date of the letter. Having considered the documents provided, the Committee was satisfied that Miss Rygielska had made no such request.
6. The Committee noted that the bundle of documents and case summary that the Committee would be considering were sent to Miss Rygielska by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 9 March 2026. The Committee did not receive the main bundle until 7 days before the hearing, however it considered that it had sufficient time to read and consider the papers in order to make a fully informed decision on this appeal.
7. In the circumstances, 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

8. The General Dental Council (Continuing Professional Development) (Dentists and Dental Care Professionals) Rules 2017 ('the CPD Rules') set out the CPD requirements placed on DCP 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.

9. The CPD Rules came into force on the 1 January 2018 and took effect in respect of dental care professionals on 1 August 2018.
10. In accordance with Rule 1, a 'CPD cycle' means, in respect of a dental care professional, a period of five years beginning on 1 August following the date the dental care professional is first registered and each subsequent period of five years. A 'CPD year' means, in respect of a dental care professional, a period of 12 months beginning on 1 August in any calendar year.
11. Miss Rygielska appealed against the Registrar's decision that she was non-compliant with her CPD requirements because she failed to submit an end of cycle CPD statement for cycle 01 August 2020 – 31 July 2025, in accordance with Rule 4.

Summary

12. The GDC's case in support of its decision was summarised as follows:

Miss Natalia Rygielska first registered with the General Dental Council ("the Council") as a dental care professional, with the title dental nurse, on 27 September 2019. Therefore, in accordance with Rule 1, Miss Rygielska's current CPD cycle began on 01 August 2020 and ended on 31 July 2025.

On 22 May 2025, the Council sent an email reminder to Miss Rygielska's registered email address. This reminder notified Miss Rygielska that her CPD year was coming to an end and reminded her that she was required to submit her CPD statement, detailing how many CPD hours she had completed during that year, by 28 August 2025. Miss Rygielska was advised that if she did not submit a compliant statement before the deadline, her registration may be put at risk.

On 10 June 2025, the Council also sent Miss Rygielska an Annual Renewal Notice letter by post to her registered address. The Annual Renewal Notice is designed to remind registrants that their registration with the Council is due for renewal, of the need to pay their annual retention fee and make their indemnity declaration and of the need to make their CPD statement. Miss Rygielska was also reminded in this notice that she was required to submit her CPD statement by 28 August 2025.

On 12 June 2025, the Council sent a further email reminder to Miss Rygielska's registered email address requesting that she submit her End of Cycle CPD statement by 28 August 2025.

On 7 July 2025, the Council sent an email to Miss Rygielska in which she was reminded that her Annual Renewal for 2026 was due on or before 31 July 2025. It

was noted that the Council was yet to receive her Annual Retention Fee or her indemnity declaration. Miss Rygielska was reminded within this email of the need to complete her CPD statement.

On 18 July 2025 and 5 August 2025, the Council sent further email reminders to Miss Rygielska's registered email address. These reminders notified Miss Rygielska that her CPD cycle was coming to an end. Both reminders stated that she was required to submit her CPD cycle statement by 28 August 2025. Miss Rygielska was notified that if she failed to submit a compliant CPD cycle statement by this date, her registration may be put at risk. Between 12 August 2025 and 26 August 2025, the Council sent three SMS reminders regarding the CPD cycle statement to Miss Rygielska's registered mobile number.

No contact was received from Miss Rygielska in response to these reminders and she failed to submit a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Statement for the cycle 1 August 2020 – 31 July 2025.

On 25 September 2025, the Council sent a notice under Rule 7 to Miss Rygielska, by recorded delivery to her registered address. The notice stated that Miss Rygielska had failed to submit a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Statement for the cycle 1 August 2020 – 31 July 2025 by the deadline of 28 August 2025 and as such, she had put her registration at risk. Miss Rygielska was informed that if she wished to retain her registration, she should submit her CPD cycle statement by 23 October 2025. The Council informed her that if the statement was not received by this date or the statement was incomplete, she may be erased from the dental care professionals register. The Council attempted to obtain confirmation that it was delivered from the Royal Mail tracking number, however, this was not available.

On 21 September 2025, a copy of the notice was also sent via email to Miss Rygielska's registered email address.

No response was received from the Appellant to this correspondence.

On 5 November 2025, the Council sent a Rule 8 notice to Miss Rygielska's registered address by recorded delivery. This notice confirmed that Miss Rygielska had failed to submit her end of cycle CPD statement for the period 1 August 2020 – 31 July 2025 and as a result, the Registrar had made the decision to remove her name from the dental care professionals register for non-compliance with the Rules. Miss Rygielska was notified that unless an appeal was submitted, the Registrar's decision would take effect on 5 December 2025.

On 6 November 2025, a copy of the notice was sent via email to Rygielska's registered email address.

On 10 November 2025, the Council received a Notice of Appeal (NOA) via email from Miss Rygielska which confirmed that she wished to appeal against the decision to remove her from the dental care professionals register.

In her NOA, Miss Rygielska indicated that she wished to appeal the decision to erase her from the register. She raised that she has made a genuine error in 'entering my end of cycle CPD log and entered these into my new year 2025-2026 instead of the previous year.'. She stated that 'The site has locked me from amending this changed'. She indicated that she had tried to make the changes after she received the GDC's correspondence dated 25 September [Rule 7 notice]. She apologised for the error.

Along with her NOA, Miss Rygielska attached some evidence of her CPD.

On 11 November 2025, Miss Rygielska's CPD evidence was assessed by a Registration Operations Officer. Miss Rygielska was deemed to be non-compliant with her CPD requirements because: Miss Rygielska failed to submit an end of cycle CPD statement for cycle 01 August 2020 – 31 July 2025 by the deadline date 28 August 2025. The registrant was then issued a Notice 7 in which to submit her CPD statement and again failed to provide an end of cycle CPD statement by the deadline 23 October 2025. It was noted that Miss Rygielska had provided some CPD certificate(s) in support of her appeal, but these did not rectify her failure to submit an end of cycle CPD statement for cycle 01 August 2020 – 31 July 2025.

As of 11 November 2025, Miss Natalia Rygielska's CPD end of cycle statement is still outstanding. The Enhanced CPD rules state for each CPD year a registrant must make a CPD Annual statement declaration.

Submissions

13. In its written submissions, the GDC submitted that Miss Rygielska is non-compliant with her CPD requirements because she has failed to submit an end of cycle CPD statement for cycle 01 August 2020 – 31 July 2025, in accordance with Rule 4.
14. It is submitted by the Registrar that Miss Rygielska was reminded on numerous occasions of the need to submit her end of cycle CPD statement.
15. As of 11 November 2025, Miss Rygielska had failed to submit an end of cycle CPD statement for cycle 01 August 2020 – 31 July 2025, which clearly breaches the requirement, under Rule 4, that dental care professionals submit an annual CPD statement to the Council.
16. While it is acknowledged that Miss Rygielska states that she had attempted to comply with her CPD requirements, she did not make attempts to submit her end of cycle CPD statement.

17. Miss Rygielska submits that she was prevented from submitting her end of cycle because she had entered the relevant data for a subsequent period, and became 'locked out' of the system to make the relevant declaration.
18. While the Registrar acknowledges the comments provided by Miss Rygielska, it was submitted that all registrants have a responsibility to ensure compliance with the CPD rules. Rule 4 provides that in the final CPD year of the cycle, the annual CPD statement must also include the total number of hours of CPD undertaken by the practitioner during the CPD cycle. Where Miss Rygielska did not complete the annual CPD statement, including of the end-of-cycle declaration, she is clearly in breach of Rule 4.
19. The GDC submitted that Registrants have a responsibility to ensure that CPD compliance is carefully submitted. While it is acknowledged the technical issues may arise from time to time, reasonable steps are expected of registrants to address those issues in a timely manner.

Committee's decision

20. The Committee had regard to the documentary evidence provided and took account of the written submissions made on behalf of the GDC and those made by Miss Rygielska in her NOA. It heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
21. Having carefully considered the information before it, the Committee noted that Miss Rygielska did not comply with the CPD requirements because she failed to submit an end of cycle CPD statement for cycle 01 August 2020 – 31 July 2025.
22. In its consideration of Miss Rygielska's circumstances, the Committee noted that there was no evidence to suggest that there were any exceptional circumstances which would have prevented Miss Rygielska from complying with the requirements for her registration. The Committee was not satisfied that the reason given by Miss Rygielska that she entered her end of cycle statement against the wrong year was acceptable and there was no documentary evidence to support this, or why she could not have submitted the end of cycle statement as requested on numerous occasions or that she contacted the GDC to seek assistance if she had made an error in submitting. It noted the certificates that Miss Rygielska provided as part of her appeal, however this was not sufficient to meet the requirements of compliance.
23. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The Committee wished to remind Miss Rygielska that it is open to her to apply for the restoration of her name to the Register upon completion of the required number of CPD hours.
24. Unless Miss Rygielska exercises her right of appeal to the County Court (if their address is in England or Wales) or the sheriff in whose sherrifdom their address is

located (if based in Scotland), in accordance with paragraph 6 of Schedule 4A to the Act, the erasure decision will take effect upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period. It will then be open to Miss Rygielska to apply for the restoration of her name if she meets the CPD and other requirements for restoration.

25. This will be confirmed to Miss Rygielska in writing.
26. That concludes this determination.