

**PART IN PRIVATE ON PAPERS****Registration Appeals Committee  
CPD Appeal Meeting****25 April 2025****Name:** MALIK, Manal**Registration number:** 297636

---

**General Dental Council:** Noranne Griffith, ILAS**Registrant:** Unrepresented

---

**Outcome:** Appeal dismissed

---

**Committee members:** Kerry McKeivitt (Lay) (Chair)  
Helen Baker (Dentist)  
Christopher Parker (Dental Care Professional)**Legal adviser:** Alex Coleman**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 Mrs Malik's name from the register for apparent non-compliance with her 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 4A 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 GDC practice.

### **Preliminary matters**

#### **Decision to conduct the appeal in the absence of the registrant 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 Mrs Malik had made no such request.
4. The Committee noted that notification of this appeal was sent to Mrs Malik by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 20 March 2025 in accordance with Rule 5 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.

#### **Application to consider the case in private**

6. In its written submissions the GDC applied for the appeal to be conducted in private in accordance with Rule 14 of the Registration Appeal Rules for the purposes of protecting Mrs Malik's health and family life.
7. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, due to the nature of the matters in this case, and having regard to the information before it, the Committee was satisfied that the personal interests of Mrs Malik outweighed the public interest in this case.
8. The Committee was, accordingly, satisfied that the appeal should be considered in private when reference was made to Mrs Malik's health and family life. It therefore acceded to the application.

### **Decision and reasons on the appeal**

#### **Background**

9. 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.

10. The CPD Rules came into force on 1 January 2018 and took effect in respect of dental care professions on 1 August 2018.
11. 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.

### **Summary**

12. Mrs Malik first registered with the GDC as a dental nurse on 31 October 2021. Her CPD cycle, which is the context of this appeal, began on 1 August 2022 and will end on 31 July 2027. In May 2024 the GDC began to send correspondence to remind Mrs Malik that she needed to provide a CPD statement in respect of the CPD year of 1 August 2023 to 31 July 2024 by no later than 28 August 2024, as well as demonstrating that she had completed at least 10 hours' worth of CPD over the previous two years.
13. On 5 November 2024 the GDC wrote to Mrs Malik to inform her that the Registrar had decided to remove her name from the register, as she had failed to demonstrate that she had completed at least 10 hours' worth of CPD over the previous two years. The GDC has identified that Mrs Malik had declared zero verifiable hours of CPD for the 2022 to 2023 CPD year and three verifiable hours of CPD for the 2023 to 2024 CPD year. This represents a shortfall of seven hours for the two-year CPD period of 1 August 2022 to 31 July 2024.
14. Mrs Malik appealed against the Registrar's decision that her CPD is non-compliant.

### **Summary of submissions**

15. In support of her appeal Mrs Malik referred to matters relating to her health, private and family life.
16. In its written submissions, the GDC submitted that, as set out above, Mrs Malik has not complied with the CPD requirements of her registration, as she has not provided the required evidence of 10 hours' worth of CPD for the two-year CPD period of 1 August 2022 to 31 July 2024. The GDC submitted that the matters referred to by Mrs Malik were not fully known to the Registrar when the decision to erase her name from the register was made, and it is a matter for the Committee to determine whether those matters mean that the appeal should be allowed.

### **Committee's decision**

17. The Committee had regard to the documentary evidence provided today. It took account of the written submissions made the GDC and those made by Mrs Malik. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser concerning its powers and the principles to which it should have regard.

18. The Committee has determined to dismiss Mrs Malik's appeal against the decision of the Registrar to remove her name from the Register. The Committee finds that Mrs Malik has not complied with her CPD requirements. Whilst it notes with sympathy the information provided by Mrs Malik about her personal and health matters, the Committee considers that this information does not suggest that Mrs Malik was unable to meet her CPD requirements, and that some of these matters fell outside of the CPD period in question. The Committee also notes that Mrs Malik has said that she was not aware of all of her CPD requirements, and it considers that she is under a duty to familiarise herself with and comply with all requirements of her registration. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.
19. Unless Mrs Malik exercises her right of appeal 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 Mrs Malik to apply for the restoration of her name if she meets the CPD and other requirements for restoration.
20. That concludes this determination.