

PART HELD IN PRIVATE

Professional Conduct Committee Initial Hearing

3 – 5 February 2026

Name: KUNDRA, Tej Kumar

Registration number: 261319

Case number: CAS-202231-Y3M1H9

General Dental Council: Callum Munday, Counsel
Instructed by Daniel Watson/ Khadija Bhatti, IHLPS

Registrant: Present
Represented by Tom Day, Counsel.
Instructed by Daryl Tollervey, the MDDUS

Fitness to practise: Impaired by reason of conviction

Outcome: Erased with Immediate Suspension

Immediate order: Immediate suspension order

Committee members: Michael Speakman (Chair, Dentist Member)
Alastair Cannon (Lay Member)
Hannah Couch (Dental Care Professional Member)

Legal adviser: Richard Ferry-Swainson

Committee Secretary: Jenny Hazell

At this hearing the Committee made a determination that includes some private information. That information has been omitted from this public version of the determination, and this public document has been marked to show where private material has been removed.

1. This is a hearing before the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC). You are present and are represented by Mr Day, Counsel. Mr Munday, Counsel, instructed by the General Dental Council's (GDC's) In-House Legal Presentation Service (IHLPS), appears for the GDC.

The charge

2. The charge that you face at this hearing is as follows:

That being registered as a dentist:

1. *On 20 February 2024 you were convicted at Snaresbrook Crown Court of an offence of fraud by false representation, contrary to sections 1(2)(a) and 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, committed between 1 April 2021 and 28 June 2022.*

AND by reason of the matters alleged above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction

Admissions

3. At the outset Mr Day, on your behalf, admitted charge 1. The Committee determined and announced that charge 1 has been found proved in light of your admission, in accordance with Rule 17(4) of the GDC (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2006 ('the Rules'). There being no more factual matters to consider, Mr Munday, on behalf of the GDC, outlined the background to your case.

Case background

4. You made a self-referral to the GDC on 15 September 2022 regarding making false claims to National Health Service (NHS) England. The matter came to light in May 2022 when the Practice Manager at the Practice where you were working at the material times, was approached by a Patient's son because they received a penalty charge notice for the full value of the treatment (£382.80). The penalty was for Band 3 treatment and the patient in question had not received Band 3 treatment, she only had an examination which was a Band 1 claim.

5. The Practice then carried out an internal audit and found that you had submitted multiple false Band 3 claims when you did not undertake the Band 3 treatment. In due course the Practice notified the NHS England Counter Fraud Authority. NHS England carried out an investigation of the claims you had made between 1 April 2021 and 28 June 2022. They identified that you submitted false claims equating to some 730 units of dental activity (UDAs) in respect of 77 patients, when the treatment did not take place. This resulted in an overpayment of £22,722.61, in which you personally received £9,581.00 as a result of your fraudulent claiming.

6. On 28 June 2022 you attended a meeting with your Clinical Support Manager and the Area Development Manager. During that meeting you explained that you could not be sure if you had carried out any or all of the treatment claimed. You were suspended by your Practice following that

meeting. You attended another meeting at the Practice on 20 July 2022 at which you made full admissions to the inappropriate claiming.

7. On 9 September 2022 you were interviewed under caution by a Senior Counter Fraud Specialist at NHS England. You accepted that you made false Band 3 claims and that you falsely inflated claims. In that interview you mentioned that you were “scared that the Practice would claw money back if he [you] did not meet his [your] units of Dental Activity.” In May 2023 NHS England Counter Fraud Authority submitted their investigation to the Crown Prosecution Service. You were subsequently charged with the offence of Fraud by false representation.

8. On 7 December 2023, you pleaded guilty at a magistrates court to a count of fraud. On 20 February 2024 at Snaresbrook Crown Court you attended a committal for sentence for the offence of “Dishonestly Make False Representation to make gain for self/another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk on 01/04/21 – 28/06/22” contrary to Section 2 and Section 1(2)(a) of the Fraud Act 2006. You were sentenced to a one-year community order with 200 hours unpaid work and a 15-day rehabilitation activity requirement. You were also ordered to pay £350 court costs and a victim surcharge of £95.

Stage 2 of the proceedings

9. The Committee has considered all the evidence presented to it. This includes the two bundles (parts one and two) of documents provided on your behalf. Part one bundle (comprising some 237 pages) contained the following:

- testimonials from professional colleagues dated October 2022 to December 2024
- testimonials dated February/March 2023 from patients and from the Manager of the Cancer Research shop
- a testimonial from your wife dated 2 February 2026
- a testimonial dated 5 December 2022 from your Dentist Mentor
- Non-Clinical CPD relating to legal, ethical and probity (amounting to some 145 hours)
- Clinical CPD (amounting to some 104 hours)
- shadowing reports and observations May 2025 - July 2025
- a potential employment offer dated 16 January 2025
- a copy of your presentation to Foundation Dental students in July 2025
- a letter dated 25 February 2025 from the course leader of a one-to-one in-person training course on ethics, which you attended on that day, and a copy of your personal reflections.

10. Part 2 Bundle (comprising some 39 pages) contained the following:

- a copy of your reflective statement dated 2 February 2026
- a report dated 31 January 2026 from your Dentist Mentor
- a copy of your Personal Development Plan (PDP)
- further copies of Non-clinical and clinical CPD.

11. In addition, you gave oral evidence to the Committee in which you accepted fully the seriousness of your actions. You set out the background to the triggers which led to the inappropriate claims, both in relation to family matters and the pressures you were experiencing at work. You maintain that you felt undervalued, without recognition and that despite undertaking additional work, you were never thanked for undertaking the additional work. Your evidence was that you were never mentioned in newsletters and that instead, what you received was the threat of claw back. You told the Committee that you felt that you needed to be rewarded and that you “lost my clinical and non-clinical integrity and performed dishonest actions out of greed.” You describe submitting one claim for UDAs and getting “away with it, and kept going.” You accepted that you made poor errors of

judgement, that you were not entitled to claim for the money and that you are ashamed for what you did.

12. In your reflective statement you set out the wider implications of your actions. You recognised that your actions fell below the standards of a dentist and that it had financial implications for the NHS and the public. You also recognise that patients could have suffered psychological harm in the event that they received a fine. Further, it led to inaccurate record keeping, leading to potential misdiagnosis and/or unnecessary treatment.

13. You set out the steps you have taken following your conviction in February 2024. You volunteered at a Cancer Research charity shop and at a hospice and you explained how supporting these organisations deepened your understanding of the importance of integrity and working in the service of others without seeking recognition. You completed a one-year Community Order and on 21 October 2024 your Rehabilitation Activity came to an end, as did your probation. Your sentence remained active until 19 February 2025.

14. You also carried out a one-day learning session in February 2025 with a legal ethicist and an integrative psychotherapist. You say that the course has taught you of the dangers of internalising professional worth through financial entitlement and the importance of moral courage when under pressure. The Committee has had regard to the letter dated 25 February 2025 from the course convenor in which they set out the learning you undertook on that day. You have also sought support through other therapeutic sessions and reflected on how these sessions have helped you.

15. Further, the Committee's attention was drawn to your work with your Dentist Mentor, with whom you have met on a regular basis since October 2022. You set out that through his mentorship and his guidance on a year-long dental risk-mitigation course, you have learnt to recognise how ethical failures can arise in certain situations.

16. You reassured the Committee that you would not repeat your dishonest behaviour again and that you would have no problem if the claiming side of your dentistry were to be held under scrutiny and that you would be content with a salaried role without any additional financial incentives. You told the Committee that the reason why you delivered a presentation to foundation dentists was because you wanted to make sure that no-one went down the same pathway you did.

Fitness to practise history

17. Mr Munday addressed the Committee in accordance with Rule 20(1)(a). He confirmed that you have no other fitness to practise history with the GDC.

Submissions

18. Mr Munday submitted that your conviction for fraud is a serious matter and engages one of the fundamental tenets of the profession – namely the requirement to be honest. He referred the Committee to paragraphs 25 and 36 of the GDC's "Fitness to Practice: Guidance for the Practice Committees" (6 January 2026) (the GDC's Guidance) which set out that "Honesty is of key importance in protecting the public and promoting and maintaining public confidence in the professions". He cited a number of the GDC's Standards for the Dental Team which you have breached. The GDC's position is that the dishonesty was planned and was repeated over a period of some 14 months and only ceased once the matter came to light following of an audit of your work in May/June 2022 following a patient complaint. As a consequence of your actions, 77 patient records were not accurate in that they did not reflect the treatment received. Mr Munday also submitted that your explanation for your actions, namely that you wanted to see your name in the practice newsletter as some kind of validation, was not credible.

19. It was Mr Munday's submission that notwithstanding the CPD you have undertaken, there is a concern of a repeat of your dishonest conduct were you to find yourself under pressure, whether it be due to personal or work reasons. He submitted that there is a need to protect the public and to uphold proper standards. Therefore a finding of impairment on public protection and public interest grounds is necessary to maintain public confidence in the dental profession.

20. Mr Munday submitted that in respect of sanction, your conviction for fraud is so serious that you are unsuited to continued registration. He said the dishonest conduct was premeditated, sustained over a period of time and was for financial gain. Mr Munday also submitted that it was an abuse of trust of your position, it was a defrauding of the public purse, it was carried out in the course of your practice as a dentist and was conduct that was incompatible with registration. Mr Munday submitted that a direction of erasure is the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case.

21. Mr Day conceded that your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction. Mr Day said that you do not seek to minimise the seriousness of your actions, but invited the Committee to have regard to the mitigating factors in this case. This included the fact that you admitted your wrongdoing from July 2022 onwards; you made full admissions to the inappropriate claiming when interviewed by NHS England Counter Fraud in September 2022; and you pleaded guilty to the offence at the Magistrates Court. Mr Day drew the Committee's attention to the supportive testimonials written on your behalf which speak to your general good character. Mr Day submitted that the dishonest conduct, although sustained, is not a reflection of your true character.

22. Mr Day also highlighted the dedication you have demonstrated in keeping your skills up to date as a dentist as well as the deep and meaningful reflection you have shown in respect of your understanding as to why you behaved dishonestly. It was Mr Day's submission that the risk of repetition of your dishonest conduct is zero and that you have sought relevant professional advice to help you work through your issues. Mr Day invited the Committee to have regard to the mitigating factors in this case, the insight you have demonstrated as well as the rehabilitative steps you have taken over the last few years. In short, Mr Day submitted that the proportionate outcome in this case is that of an order of suspension for a period of 12 months, which is the maximum period, with a review to take place before the expiry of that order.

23. Mr Day highlighted that your registration has already been suspended for the last 3 years by virtue of an interim order of suspension. This would mean that were the Committee minded to direct that your name be erased from the Register, you would not be able to apply for restoration to the Register for a period of 5 years, which, adding on the 3 years when you were suspended, would mean a total of 8 years when you would not be working as a dentist. Mr Day submitted that the public interest can still be maintained in the declaring and upholding of professional standards by virtue of the whole fitness to practise proceedings, including the three years when your registration was subject to an interim order of suspension, and by a substantive direction of 12 months suspension, with a review hearing. He accepted that there are a number of factors in this case that might suggest erasure but that was so in many cases where nevertheless erasure does not result. Mr Day invited the Committee to make a direction of suspension instead.

Current Impairment

24. The Committee considered whether your fitness to practise is currently impaired by reason of your conviction. It had regard to the over-arching objective of the GDC, which is: the protection, promotion and maintenance of the health, safety, and well-being of the public; the promotion and maintenance of public confidence in the dental profession; and the promotion and maintenance of proper professional standards and conduct for the members of the dental profession. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee has kept in mind the relevant sections set out in the GDC's Guidance

(January 2026). The Committee has considered the submissions made by both parties. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

25. The Committee considered carefully the nature and gravity of your criminal conduct, for which you were convicted for fraud in February 2024. Over a period of some 14 months you knowingly submitted false claims purporting that work had been done in relation to patients who were exempt from making payment. It equated to some 730 units of UDAs in respect of 77 patients. It was a planned course of conduct for your own financial gain and had the effect of running up a fraudulent amount of over £22,000. Your dishonest conduct carried on for a significant period of time and only ceased when the matter came to light. The total loss to the NHS, and the public purse, was over £22,000. By your own admission, it was not a technical failure or a misunderstanding of the claiming process.

26. The Committee has taken into account your expressions of remorse and regret as well as the fact that you pleaded guilty to the offence. It considers that you have developed and expressed significant insight into the adverse impact that your conduct and resulting conviction will have had upon the public's confidence in the profession and that you fully recognise and accept that you have brought the profession into disrepute. However, the Committee was not convinced by your explanation of what motivated you to claim for work not done.

27. [Private] you began to make dishonest claims to make others think that you were doing better at work than was really the case, as it would appear that your UDA targets were being exceeded. You hoped that this would lead to a supportive mention in the practice newsletter, [Private].

28. You told the Committee that, had you achieved a mention in the practice newsletter, then that would have been enough of a validation and you would have stopped your dishonest claiming. The Committee considered you had created this false narrative to excuse your actions, rather than admit your true motive, namely one of greed. However, the Committee accepted the submissions on your behalf that these proceedings have had a profoundly chastening effect such that a risk of repetition of this type of dishonest behaviour is very low.

29. The Committee considers that your dishonest conduct is extremely serious and you have breached one of the fundamental tenets of the profession – namely to be honest and trustworthy. In the Committee's view, such conduct is liable to have brought the profession in disrepute. In the Committee's judgement, you have breached the following GDC's Standards:

- 1.3 You must be honest and act with integrity.
 - 1.3.1 You must justify the trust that patients, the public and your colleagues place in you by always acting honestly and fairly in your dealings with them. This applies to any business or education activities in which you are involved as well as to your professional dealings.
 - 1.3.2 You must make sure you do not bring the profession into disrepute.
- 4.1 You must make and keep contemporaneous, complete and accurate patient records
- 9.1 Ensure that your conduct, both at work and in your personal life, justifies patients' trust in you and the public's trust in the dental profession.

30. The Committee is satisfied that your behaviour has brought the reputation of the profession into disrepute. In the Committee's judgement public trust and confidence in the profession, and in the regulator, would be seriously undermined if a finding of impairment were

not made in the particular circumstances of this case. Furthermore, a finding of current impairment is necessary to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession, and to declare and uphold proper standards. There are no current clinical concerns or patient safety issues in this case. It has therefore determined that your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your conviction solely on the grounds of the public interest.

Sanction

31. The Committee then determined what sanction, if any, is appropriate in light of the findings of facts and impairment it has made. The Committee is aware that the purpose of a sanction is not to be punitive, although it may have such an effect, but is instead imposed to protect patients and safeguard the wider public interest considerations.

32. In reaching its decision the Committee has had regard to the GDC's Guidance. The Committee has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the public interest with your own interests.

33. The Committee has paid due regard to the mitigating and aggravating factors present in this case. In respect of the mitigating factors that are present, the Committee has taken into account the following:

- evidence of good conduct in the time since the events in question
- your expressions of remorse and your apologies
- you repaid the money you owed
- there has been no repetition of your offending behaviour
- you have no previous fitness to practise history with the GDC

34. The Committee found the following aggravating factors to be present:

- This was premeditated conduct
- It persisted over an extended period of time
- It was for personal financial gain and this was a defrauding of the public purse
- It was an abuse of your position of trust
- It was conducted during the course of your practice as a dentist
- It led to the deliberate creation of falsified patient records in respect of 77 patients.

35. The Committee also considered that your actions could have compromised patient care as it gave the impression that a different course of treatment was being carried out when this was not the case. In addition, the Committee has heard that a patient received a Penalty Notice as a direct result of your dishonest claim.

36. The Committee has had regard to the bundles of documents before it, including the testimonials submitted on your behalf. In respect of the testimonials, aside from the recent one from your wife, the Committee has borne in mind that all but one of the others pre-date your conviction in February 2024. You told the Committee that you do not know if those who provided testimonials are aware that you had been convicted of fraud as you had not spoken to them since. Accordingly, it could not be known if their views remained the same, notwithstanding the conviction. The Committee has therefore given limited weight to the testimonials.

37. The Committee has considered the range of sanctions available to it, starting with the least restrictive. In the light of its findings, the Committee considers that taking no action, or imposing a reprimand, would not be sufficient in the particular circumstances of this case. In the Committee's

judgement, the nature and seriousness of the matters giving rise to its finding of impairment mean that public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process would be significantly undermined if no action were taken or a reprimand were issued. Furthermore, no action or a reprimand would not be enough to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour.

38. The Committee next considered whether a direction of conditional registration would be appropriate and proportionate. In the Committee's judgement conditions cannot adequately address the behaviour that has been identified. In any event, the Committee considers that a direction of conditions would be insufficient to declare and uphold proper professional standards of conduct and behaviour and to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession and in the regulatory process in the particular circumstances of this case.

39. The Committee has had regard to the steps you have taken to address the concerns in this case. It has also had regard to your expressions of remorse and regret as well as the CPD you have undertaken. It is clear that these proceedings have had a salutary effect on you.

40. However, in the Committee's view, your dishonesty represents a serious departure from professional standards and is highly damaging to your fitness to practise. It represents an abuse of trust by someone in a position of authority. The Judge, in sentencing you, stated: "*This was a serious offence on any analysis. Not only did it carry on for a significant period of time and cause significant loss to the company, the impact of the offence beyond that is that it erodes the public's trust in what is an important profession... it causes the public and patients to question the legitimacy of their treatment.*"

41. The Committee considers that a direction of suspended registration would not be sufficient to satisfy the wider public interest. This is because you made the deliberate decision, within your practice as a dentist, to defraud the public purse by making false claims for UDAs that you and the Practice were not entitled to. You did this once and having got away with it continued to do so over a period of 14 months, involving some 77 patients and 730 UDAs. The Committee has concluded that you were motivated by greed. Such profoundly dishonest behaviour, directly linked to your practice as a Dentist, is fundamentally incompatible with continued registration. Accordingly, the Committee considers that a direction of suspended registration would not be sufficient.

42. The Committee considers that points a, d, f and h of paragraph 282 (under the heading 'erasure') of the GDC's Guidance are applicable in this case. They are as follows:

- a. The findings include serious departure(s) from the relevant professional standards.
- d. Where the findings include the abuse of a position of trust, or violation of the rights of patients, colleagues, or other persons, and particularly if involving vulnerable persons.
- f. Where the findings include serious dishonesty, particularly where persistent or covered up.
- h. A lesser sanction would be insufficient to meet the public interest.

43. The Committee has determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction to impose in the particular circumstances of this case is that of erasure. The Committee hereby directs that your name be erased from the register.

44. The Committee now invites submissions from both parties on the imposition of an immediate order, following the revocation of the interim order of suspension.

Immediate Order

45. The Interim Order of Suspension currently in place on your registration is hereby revoked.
46. Mr Munday made an application for an immediate suspension order to be imposed on your registration under Section 30(1) of the Dentists Act 1984. He submitted that immediate action is required to maintain public confidence in the professions for the same reasons submitted on behalf of the GDC for the direction of erasure.
47. Mr Day submitted that there is no prospect of you trying to obtain work during the intervening 28 day appeal period. Nevertheless, he submitted that there is a high bar for the making of an immediate order solely on the grounds of the public interest and this is not made out in this case.
48. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, who drew its attention to the relevant guidance contained at paragraphs 285 onwards of the GDC's Fitness to Practise: Guidance for the practice committees (January 2026).
49. The Committee determined that the imposition of an immediate order of suspension on your registration is necessary in the public interest. It considered that the nature of your conduct and conviction are serious, and specifically relate to dishonesty within the dental profession. The Committee therefore determined that it would be necessary and proportionate to impose an immediate order of suspension in order to maintain the public's confidence in the dental profession and its regulator.
50. The effect of this immediate order is that your registration is now suspended. Unless you exercise your right of appeal, the substantive direction of erasure will replace the immediate suspension upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period. Should you exercise your right of appeal, this immediate order shall remain in force pending the resolution of the appeal.
51. That concludes this determination.