

ON PAPERS

Registration Appeals Committee (CPD Appeal)

24 March 2026

Name: CUTUS, Paul
Registration number: 278711
Case number: CAS-213479-F0X2J9

General Dental Council: Needa Bhatti, 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

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

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 Mr Cutus 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 Mr Cutus 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 Mr Cutus and on the papers

4. Notification of this appeal was sent to Mr Cutus 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 Mr Cutus's appeal, dated 13 November 2025, informed Mr Cutus that he could request an oral hearing within 28 days of the date of the letter. Having considered the documents provided, the Committee was satisfied that Mr Cutus 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 Mr Cutus 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.

Private Hearing

8. At the beginning of the hearing, the Committee considered whether, under Rule 14(1) of the Appeal Rules, this appeal should be held in private since the matters under consideration relate to matters relating to Mr Cutus's private and family life.
9. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, the Committee decided that to protect Mr Cutus's private and family life a private and public determination will be produced if required.

Decision and reasons on the appeal

Background

10. 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.
11. The CPD Rules came into force on the 1 January 2018 and took effect in respect of dental care professionals on 1 August 2018.
12. 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.
13. Mr Cutus appealed against the Registrar's decision that his CPD is non-compliant because he failed to provide a compliant CPD record demonstrating that he had met the required minimum CPD requirement for the period 1 August 2023 to 31 July 2025.

Summary

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

Mr Cutus first registered with the General Dental Council ('the Council') as a dental nurse on 28 July 2018. Therefore, in accordance with Rule 1 as set out above, Mr Cutus' current CPD cycle began on 1 August 2023 and will end on 31 July 2028.

On 22 May 2025, the Council sent an email reminder to Mr Cutus' registered email address. This reminder notified Mr Cutus that his 2024-2025 CPD year was coming to an end and reminded him that he was required to submit his CPD statement, detailing how many CPD hours he had completed during that year, by 28 August 2025. The email also reminded Mr Cutus of the need to complete a minimum of 10

hours of CPD during each period of two consecutive years, including any two year period spanning over more than one CPD cycle. Mr Cutus was notified that if he failed to submit his CPD statement by this date his registration may be put at risk.

On 10 June 2025, the Council sent Mr Cutus an Annual Renewal Notice letter by post to his 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. Mr Cutus was also reminded in this notice that he was required to submit his CPD statement by 28 August 2025. This letter also reminded Mr Cutus of the need to complete a minimum of 10 hours of CPD for every two consecutive CPD years of registration.

On 7 July 2025, the Council sent an email to Mr Cutus in which he was reminded that his Annual Renewal was due on or before 31 July 2025. It was noted that the Council was yet to receive his Annual Retention Fee and his indemnity declaration. Mr Cutus was reminded within this email of the need to submit his CPD statement by 28 August 2025. The email also reminded Mr Cutus of the need to complete a minimum of 10 hours of CPD during any two consecutive years, including any two-year period spanning over more than one CPD cycle.

On 12 June 2025, 18 July 2025 and 5 August 2025, the Council sent email reminders to Mr Cutus' registered email address. These reminders notified Mr Cutus that his CPD year was coming to an end. The reminders stated that he was required to submit his CPD statement by 28 August 2025. Mr Cutus was notified that if he failed to submit a compliant CPD statement by this date, his registration may be put at risk.

Between 12 August 2025 and 28 August 2025, the Council sent three text message reminders to Mr Cutus' registered mobile number requesting that he submit his 2024-2025 CPD annual statement by 28 August 2025.

On 23 August 2025 Mr Cutus submitted an annual CPD statement for the 2024-2025 CPD year, declaring that he had completed two verifiable CPD hours.

On 25 September 2025, the Council sent Mr Cutus a notice under Rule 6 of the 2017 Rules to his registered address by recorded delivery. The notice stated that, although Mr Cutus had submitted a CPD statement to the Council, he had not declared enough hours to meet the requirement to complete a minimum of 10 hours of CPD over two consecutive years. Mr Cutus was informed that he had previously submitted a CPD statement for 2023-2024 detailing two verifiable CPD hours and then submitted a statement for 2024-2025 with two verifiable CPD hours. Mr Cutus was informed that he needed to submit a compliant CPD record covering 1 August 2023 to 31 July 2025 by the deadline of 23 October 2025. Mr Cutus was notified that if the Council did not receive a response to the notice or if following a review of his response it was considered that his CPD requirements had not been met, he may be

erased from the dental care professionals register. Mr Cutus was also asked to inform the Council if there were any reasons or exceptional circumstances that had meant he was unable to submit a compliant statement for the relevant period. On 26 September 2025, a copy of the notice was also sent via email to Mr Cutus' registered email address.

Mr Cutus did not send his CPD record as requested by 23 October 2025.

On 5 November 2025, the Council sent a Rule 8 Notice to Mr Cutus' registered address by recorded delivery. On 6 November 2025, a copy of the notice was also sent to Mr Cutus by email

This notice confirmed that Mr Cutus had failed to provide a compliant CPD record demonstrating that he had met the minimum CPD requirement for the period 1 August 2023 – 31 July 2025. Mr Cutus had also not provided any evidence of exceptional personal circumstances which may have prevented him from completing his CPD as required. As a result, the Registrar had made the decision to remove his name from the dental care professionals register for non-compliance with the 2017 Rules. Mr Cutus was notified that unless an appeal was submitted, the Registrar's decision would take effect on 5 December 2025.

On 8 November 2025, the Council received an email from Mr Cutus including a Notice of Appeal ('NOA') and CPD evidence. The email set out the following:

- a. Mr Cutus' failure to submit his CPD record was due to an administrative oversight. He had completed the required CPD hours and was able to provide documentary evidence of this.
- b. [PRIVATE].
- c. Mr Cutus requested that his case be reviewed, and he be permitted to submit his complete CPD record before any final action was taken.
- d. Mr Cutus remained committed to upholding the standards of the profession and ensuring compliance with the Council's requirements.

On 18 November 2025 the Dental Professional Hearing Service (DPHS) received an email from Mr Cutus and further CPD evidence. The email set out the following:

- a. Mr Cutus clarified that he was not currently working in a clinical capacity. Therefore, he had been unaware that he was still required to comply with the requirement to complete a minimum of 10 hours CPD in a two-year period. He now understood that the requirement applied irrespective of whether he was practising. This misunderstanding had led to his shortfall.
- b. Mr Cutus valued his professional registration and wished to maintain it despite that he was not currently practising in a clinical capacity. He had not

- intended to be non-compliant with his CPD requirements or risk removal from the register.*
- c. Mr Cutus had located evidence of further CPD undertaken which he attached. He queried whether he was able to provide evidence of further CPD, a Personal Development Plan and activity log which he was currently undertaking.*
 - d. Mr Cutus wished for his email correspondence and further evidence to be taken into consideration as part of his appeal.*

On 24 November 2025 the DPHS received an email from Mr Cutus. This email thanked the DPHS for assisting him with his appeal and duplicated the contents of the email and CPD evidence originally provided on 18 November 2025

On 2 December 2025 the DPHS received an email from Mr Cutus together with further CPD evidence.

On 3 December 2025, Mr Cutus' NOA and CPD evidence was reviewed by the Council's Senior Operations Officer. A copy of this assessment appears at page 79 [of the appeal bundle] and sets out why Mr Cutus' CPD evidence was non-compliant:

- "Mr Paul Cutus has failed to provide sufficient evidence that demonstrates compliance with the CPD requirement of completing 10 hours of verifiable CPD over 2 consecutive years.*
- Agilio certificates provided were duplicated, including x3 dated 5 July 2024; x2 dated 6 January 2025; x2 dated 7 January 2025; and x1 dated 8 January 2025.*
- P&G certificate dated 1 August 2025 was both duplicated and outside the required cycle year.*
- X3 Agilio certificates dated 24 November 2025, were also outside the requested cycle year.*
- P&G certificate dated 5 June 2025 provided had no development outcome.*
- X2 P&G certificate dated 7 July 2025 provided had no development outcome.*

As of 3 December 2025, Mr Cutus had demonstrated that he had completed seven hours of verifiable CPD hours for the period 1 August 2023 – 31 July 2025. Mr Cutus was therefore required to provide a further three hours of CPD evidence for this period.

Submissions

15. In its written submissions, the GDC submitted that Mr Cutus is non-compliant with his CPD requirements because he has failed to demonstrate that he has completed the minimum requirement to undertake 10 hours of verifiable CPD during the period 1 August 2023 to 31 July 2025.

16. The GDC, in its written submissions notes that Mr Cutus has provided some CPD documentation with his NOA for CPD completed after 31 July 2025. Only CPD undertaken between 1 August 2023 – 31 July 2025 can be considered by the Registrar when assessing compliance under Rule 2(5) of the 2017 Rules.
17. The GDC noted that Mr Cutus also provided some CPD documentation with his NOA which does not comply with part of the documentary requirements in Rule 2(6) of the 2017 Rules. Only CPD documentary evidence which meets the requirements in Rule 2(6) can be accepted by the Registrar when assessing compliance under the Rules.
18. The GDC submitted that Mr Cutus was sent reminders as early as 22 May 2025 drawing his attention to the requirement that dental care professionals must complete a minimum of 10 hours of CPD in each two-year period.
19. As of 24 February 2026 the GDC was of the view that Mr Cutus had completed seven verifiable CPD hours between 1 August 2023 and 31 July 2025 and had a shortfall of three hours. Therefore, the assessment at that time was that Mr Cutus failed to meet the requirement that dental care professionals complete a minimum of 10 verifiable CPD hours in each two-year period as per Rule 2(5) of the 2017 Rules.
20. Mr Cutus outlined a number of personal circumstances which occurred over the relevant period. The Registrar acknowledged Mr Cutus's personal difficulties, and the impact that personal circumstances can have on working life. However, it is submitted by the Registrar that Mr Cutus was reminded on numerous occasions of the need to submit his annual CPD statement.
21. On 10 March 2026 Mr Cutus sent an email to the GDC attaching a number of CPD certificates. This brought his verifiable hours to nine, one hour short of the required ten hours.

Committee's decision

22. 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 Mr Cutus in his NOA. It heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
23. Having carefully considered the information before it, the Committee noted that Mr Cutus did not complete his required CPD hours for the period 1 August 2023 – 31 July 2025.
24. In its consideration of Mr Cutus's personal circumstances, the Committee had regard to the GDC document, *'Guidance on the Registrar's Discretion to Erase for CPD*

Non-Compliance (May 2025), referred to hereafter as ‘the Guidance’, and the criteria outlined from paragraph 13, which states:

Assessing Exceptional Circumstances

13. *In determining whether to erase under Rule 8, the Registrar will first consider whether there is any evidence that the registrant was prevented from complying with their required CPD requirements due to exceptional personal circumstances which were beyond their control. This may include serious illness, for which medical evidence has been provided, or other unforeseen events such as bereavement of a close relative (spouse/partner, parent, child, or sibling).*

25. Whilst the Committee gave careful consideration to the circumstances outlined by Mr Cutus and it was sympathetic to his difficult personal circumstances, it noted that he did not provide any supporting evidence, as advised in the Rule 8 notice letter. The Rule 8 notice states:

‘If you have documentary evidence that you have in fact fully complied with your CPD requirements, then you are strongly advised to submit this with your appeal’.

The following must be attached to the notice of appeal:

- *A copy of any documents on which the appellant proposes to rely for the purposes of the Appeal.’*

26. The Committee took into account Mr Cutus’s assertion that he took time off work during the period and wasn’t aware that he was still required to submit CPD hours if he was not working. However, there was no documentary evidence to support this, and the Committee concluded that it is the responsibility of a registrant to ensure that they are aware of the requirements of registration. In this regard, the Committee was unable to conclude that Mr Cutus’s absence from work and his personal circumstances prevented him from complying with his CPD requirements between 2023 and 2025.
27. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The Committee wished to remind Mr Cutus that it is open to him to apply for the restoration of his name to the Register upon completion of the required number of CPD hours.
28. Unless Mr Cutus exercises his 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 Mr Cutus to apply for the restoration of his name if he meets the CPD and other requirements for restoration.

29. This will be confirmed to Mr Cutus in writing.

30. That concludes this determination.