

ON PAPERS

Registration Appeals Committee (CPD Appeal Hearing)

13 November 2025

Name: VITKUNAITE, Beatrice

Registration number: 287252

Case number: CAS-211206-Y8D4V1

General Dental Council: Ela Rexhaj, ILAS

Registrant: Unrepresented

Outcome: Appeal dismissed

Committee members: Susan Stevens (Dentist) (Chair)
Stacey Firby (Dental Care Professional)
Jim Hurden (Lay)

Legal adviser: Gerard Coll

Committee Secretary: Andrew Keeling

At this meeting 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 meeting before the Registration Appeals Committee (RAC). The meeting was conducted remotely on Microsoft Teams.
2. The appeal was against the decision of the Registrar of the General Dental Council (GDC) to erase Ms Vitkunaite from the Register for apparent non-compliance with the statutory Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements. The meeting 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 meeting. The Committee first considered the issues of service and whether to proceed with the meeting on the papers in the absence of Ms Vitkunaite 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 Ms Vitkunaite and on the papers

4. Notification of this appeal was sent to Ms Vitkunaite by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 25 September 2025 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. Having considered the documents provided, the Committee was satisfied that Ms Vitkunaite 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 Ms Vitkunaite by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 25 September 2025.
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 Application

8. The Committee noted the Council's application, made in their written submissions, for today's meeting to be part-held in private in order to protect Ms Vitkunaite's private and family life. Having accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, the Committee decided to accede to the application for the reasons put forward by the Council. The meeting was therefore part-held in private and a private and public determination will be produced.

Summary of the Legal Framework

9. Section 34A of the Act sets out the requirements for dentists' training and development as follows:

'(1) Rules shall require registered dentists to undertake such professional training and development as may be specified in the rules.

(2) If it appears to the registrar that a person has failed to comply with the requirements of rules made under subsection (1), the registrar may erase the person's name from the register.

...

(4) *Rules shall specify the procedures to be followed before the registrar –*

(a) may erase a person's name from the register under subsection (2);'

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 Dentist registrants and the steps that the GDC shall take in respect of registrants' compliance and non-compliance with those requirements.
11. The current CPD Rules came into force on 1 January 2018 and took effect in respect of dentists on the same date.
12. In accordance with Rule 1, a 'CPD cycle' means, in respect of a dentist, a period of five years beginning on 1 January following the date the dentist is first registered and each subsequent period of five years. A 'CPD year' means, in respect of a dentist, a period of 12 months beginning on 1 January in any calendar year.
13. Rule 2(1) of the CPD Rules sets out that dentists must complete a minimum of 100 hours of CPD within each CPD cycle.
14. Rule 2 states that "*CPD undertaken in each CPD cycle must include activities relevant to each field of practice in which the practitioner practised during that cycle.*"
15. Rule 2 also states that in completing the minimum number of hours, a practitioner who is not a temporary registrant must undertake at least 10 hours of CPD during each period of two consecutive CPD years (including any such two-year period which spans over more than one CPD cycle).
16. Rule 2 further states that any CPD undertaken by the practitioner is only to count towards the minimum number of hours, if –
 - a. there is documentary evidence from the provider of the CPD which states –
 - i. the subjects, learning content, aims, objectives and anticipated learning outcomes of the CPD and the date that the CPD was undertaken,
 - ii. the total number of hours of CPD undertaken,
 - iii. the name of the practitioner who has participated in the CPD activity,
 - iv. that the CPD is subject to quality assurance and the name of the person or body providing the quality assurance is provided;
 - b. that documentary evidence includes confirmation from the provider that the information contained in it is full and accurate; and
 - c. the CPD delivered a learning outcome identified in the practitioner's CPD record in accordance with Rule 3(2)(a).

17. Rule 3 provides the requirement that all registrants must maintain a written record of all CPD that the practitioner plans to undertake and has undertaken during the CPD cycle. Rule 3 also sets out what the written record must include.
18. Rule 4 of the CPD Rules states that for each CPD year, a practitioner must submit to the Registrar a statement which confirms the number of hours of CPD undertaken during that corresponding year or, if the practitioner has not undertaken any CPD in that CPD year, confirmation that no CPD has been undertaken. The practitioner must also confirm in this statement that they have kept a CPD record, that the CPD undertaken (where applicable) was relevant to the practitioner's field of practice and declare the information in their statement is full and accurate. This statement must be completed within 28 days of the end of that CPD year.
19. Rules 6 and 7 prescribe various notification requirements under which the Registrar may require a practitioner to, among other things, submit their CPD record and/or provide evidence of their compliance with the CPD requirement.
20. Rule 8 provides that the Registrar "*may erase the practitioner's name*" in circumstances where the practitioner has either failed to comply with a notice sent under Rule 6 or 7, or where the Registrar is not satisfied from the response provided by the practitioner that they have met the CPD requirement and/or other related obligations under the relevant Rules.
21. In accordance with Rule 9, it is open to the practitioner who has not complied with the CPD requirement as set out in Rule 2 in respect of a CPD cycle, to apply in writing to the Registrar for a further period in which to complete the outstanding CPD in respect of that cycle (a "period of grace"). They must do so before the end of the CPD cycle but no sooner than six months before the end of the cycle.

Summary of the factual background

22. Ms Vitkunaite first registered with the GDC as a dentist, on 6 January 2020. Therefore, in accordance with Rule 1 as set out above, her current CPD cycle began on 1 January 2021 and will end on 31 December 2025.
23. On 22 October 2024, the Council sent an email reminder to Ms Vitkunaite's registered email address. This reminder notified Ms Vitkunaite 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 January 2025. Ms Vitkunaite was advised that if she did not submit a compliant statement before the deadline, her registration may be put at risk.
24. On 11 November 2024, the Council also sent Ms Vitkunaite an Annual Renewal Notice 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. Ms Vitkunaite was also reminded in the Annual Renewal Notice that she was required to submit her CPD statement by 28 January 2025. It was stated that Ms Vitkunaite would need to have completed at least 10 hours of CPD over the last two years, unless she was in the first year of her first CPD cycle.

25. On 26 November 2024, the Council sent a further email reminder to Ms Vitkunaite's registered email address, requesting that she submit her CPD statement by 28 January 2025 and stating that she was required to complete a minimum of 10 hours of CPD during each period of two consecutive years.
26. On 5 December 2024, the Council sent an email to Ms Vitkunaite in which she was reminded that her Annual Renewal for 2025 was due on or before 31 December 2024. It was noted that the Council was yet to receive her Annual Retention Fee or her indemnity declaration. Ms Vitkunaite was reminded within this email of the need to complete her CPD statement and of the requirement to complete 10 verifiable CPD hours during any two consecutive years.
27. On 12 December 2024 and 8 January 2025, the Council sent further email reminders to Ms Vitkunaite's registered email address. These reminders notified Ms Vitkunaite that her CPD year was coming to an end and stated that she was required to submit her CPD statement by 28 January 2025. The requirement to complete 10 hours of CPD during each period of two consecutive years was reiterated. Ms Vitkunaite was notified that if she failed to submit a compliant CPD statement by this date, her registration may be put at risk.

Rule 6 Notice

28. On 24 February 2025, the Council sent a notice under Rule 6 to Ms Vitkunaite by recorded delivery to her registered address. The notice stated that, although Ms Vitkunaite had submitted a CPD statement to the Council, she had not declared enough hours to meet the requirement to complete a minimum of 10 hours of CPD over two consecutive years. It was noted that she had submitted an annual CPD statement of 0 verifiable hours for the 2023 CPD year and an annual CPD statement of 9 verifiable hours for the 2024 CPD year. The notice stated that if Ms Vitkunaite wished to retain her registration, she should submit her CPD record to the Registrar by 24 March 2025 in order to demonstrate that she had met the requirement. Ms Vitkunaite was informed that if the Council did not receive a response to the notice or if her response was unsatisfactory, she may be erased from the register. On 25 February 2025, a copy of the notice was also sent via email to Ms Vitkunaite's registered email address.
29. On 3 March 2025, the Council received correspondence from Ms Vitkunaite, this included:

- a. A letter from Ms Vitkunaite dated 28 February 2025: in this letter, Ms Vitkunaite detailed that the reason for her non-compliance was due to [PRIVATE]. Ms Vitkunaite explained she remained committed to fulfilling her professional obligations and she offered to submit a detailed plan outlining how she would achieve her hours within a reasonable extended timeframe. Based on the circumstances she detailed, Ms Vitkunaite asked for an extension to the deadline to complete her outstanding CPD hours.
 - b. CPD certificates.
30. On the same day, the Council wrote to Ms Vitkunaite via email to acknowledge receipt of her CPD record for assessment and advised a response could take up to six weeks.
31. On 4 March 2025, the Council wrote to Ms Vitkunaite upon reviewing her letter and CPD record. The Council requested Ms Vitkunaite to elaborate on the circumstances she referred to in her letter that prevented her from completing her CPD requirement for the period of 1 January 2023 – 31 December 2024. The Council requested that Ms Vitkunaite responds to the email by 18 March 2025.
32. On 4 March 2025, Ms Vitkunaite responded to the Council's email. She reiterated the points in her 28 February 2025 letter, explaining [PRIVATE]. Ms Vitkunaite also requested that the Council allow her to make up her shortfall with additional hours completed in the 2025 CPD year.
33. On 5 March 2025, the Council responded to Ms Vitkunaite acknowledging her response to the requested information and advised a response may take up to six weeks. The Council also clarified that CPD completed outside the cycle dates requested (1 January 2023-31 December 2024) would not be applicable for this assessment.

Rule 8 Notice

34. On 4 April 2025, the Council sent a Rule 8 notice to Ms Vitkunaite's registered address by recorded delivery. This notice confirmed that Ms Vitkunaite had failed to provide a compliant CPD record demonstrating that she had met the minimum requirement for the period 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024. The notice also referred to Ms Vitkunaite's 28 February 2025 letter and 4 March 2025 email, and confirmed the Registrar applied the Guidance on the Registrar's Discretion to erase for CPD Non-compliance. The following relevant factors were identified:
 - i. The events Ms Vitkunaite described were not exceptional personal circumstances beyond her control.

- ii. If Ms Vitkunaite is registered with the GDC, she must continue to do CPD even if she is not currently working for any reason [PRIVATE]. If she wishes to remain registered, she will need to continue to meet her CPD requirements [PRIVATE]. This is because CPD is a legal requirement of registration.
- iii. [PRIVATE]
- iv. The CPD she has completed since the timeframe under consideration is not relevant.

35. As a result, the Registrar had made the decision to remove Ms Vitkunaite's name from the register for non-compliance with the Rules. Ms Vitkunaite was notified that unless an appeal was submitted, the Registrar's decision would take effect on 7 May 2025.

36. On 15 April 2025, Ms Vitkunaite wrote to the Council via email to seek clarification regarding a CPD deficiency detailed in the Rule 8 notice which outlined a duplicate on her CPD record.

37. On 16 April 2025, the Council responded to Ms Vitkunaite's email detailing that the following duplicates were identified in her CPD record:

- a. Medical Emergencies as one of 6 subjects in Core Recommended CPD Update 2023 (total of 7 hours), and
- b. The Do's and Don'ts of Medical Emergencies in Dental Practice certificate (2 hours).

38. The Council explained that the course content was identical across the two courses (for the medical emergencies portion). Accordingly, Ms Vitkunaite was awarded 7 hours of CPD. In the same email, the Council directed Ms Vitkunaite to the instructions contained in the Rule 8 notice.

Notice of Appeal

39. On 30 April 2025, the Council received a Notice of Appeal ("NOA") via email from Ms Vitkunaite which confirmed that she wished to appeal against the decision to remove her from the register.

40. Ms Vitkunaite explained she considered all professionals were entitled to a fair and transparent process. Her NOA set out the following grounds of appeal:

- [PRIVATE].
- Previous good record of compliance: She also noted that prior to this, she maintained an adequate record of CPD hours.
- Ongoing commitment to professional development: Ms Vitkunaite detailed that she has attended courses outside the United Kingdom which have aided her

professional development but that are not verifiable in the United Kingdom. She explained that she deeply regretted the lapse in her CPD and to demonstrate her commitment, she completed 23 hours of CPD hours for her current cycle.

- Impact on her livelihood: She outlined that her removal from the register will have a negative impact on her ability to earn a living and support her family. She further explained her removal from the register will negatively impact on her identity and contributor as a healthcare provider.
- Finally, Ms Vitkunaite explained that she was fully committed to practising dentistry safely, ethically, and competently. She indicated she was willing to comply with any conditions or undertakings the Council wanted to impose as an alternative to removal. She indicated she was willing to attend the appeal hearing.

41. With the NOA, Ms Vitkunaite attached her activity log, CPD certificates for the cycle 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024 and personal development plan.

42. On 1 May 2025, Ms Vitkunaite's CPD evidence was assessed by the GDC. She was deemed to be non-compliant with her CPD requirements on the basis that she had 3 verifiable CPD hours outstanding for the period 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024. It was noted that the CPD certificates provided by Ms Vitkunaite in support of her appeal were duplicates of certificates submitted previously and therefore, they could not be counted for the purpose of the assessment. It was confirmed that, as of 1 May 2025, Ms Vitkunaite had completed 7 verifiable CPD hours between 1 January 2023 and 31 December 2024.

Submissions

43. In the GDC's written submissions, the Registrar's position was set out as follows:

'It is the Registrar's position that the Appellant is non-compliant with the CPD requirements because she has failed to provide a CPD record demonstrating that she has completed the minimum requirement for the period 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024, in accordance with Rule 2.

It is submitted by the Registrar that the Appellant was reminded on numerous occasions of the need to complete her CPD hours and of the requirement to complete 10 verifiable CPD hours in each two-year period, as set out in detail above.

[PRIVATE] *However, the Registrar submits that it is the Appellant's responsibility to ensure that she meets her CPD requirements, as CPD compliance is a legal requirement of registration.*

It is noted that the Appellant completed additional CPD after the stipulated deadline, to demonstrate her willingness to her professional development. The Registrar

submits that, any CPD completed outside of the relevant period (1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024) cannot be considered for the purpose of this appeal.

As set out in the legal framework, there is no power to waive these provisions.

As of 1 May 2025, the Appellant had completed 7 verifiable CPD hours between 1 January 2023 and 31 December 2024, which clearly breaches the requirement that dentists submit evidence that they have completed a minimum of 10 verifiable CPD hours in each two-year period.

It is open to the Appellant to apply to restore her registration at any time following this appeal.'

Committee's decision and reasons on the appeal

44. The Committee had regard to the documentary evidence provided today and took account of the written submissions made by the GDC and Ms Vitkunaite's Notice of Appeal. It accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee also took note of the GDC's *Guidance on the Registrar's Discretion to Erase for CPD Non-Compliance* (February 2024).
45. The first consideration for the Committee was whether Ms Vitkunaite had complied with her obligations under the CPD Rules by demonstrating completion of at least 10 hours of verifiable CPD within the period 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024.
46. Having carefully reviewed the CPD records which Ms Vitkunaite submitted, the Committee determined that she demonstrates having completed 7 verifiable hours of CPD within the period of 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2024. This was consistent with the Registrar's assessment that Ms Vitkunaite was 3 hours short in the relevant period. Therefore, the Committee determined that Ms Vitkunaite is not compliant with her statutory obligations under the CPD Rules.
47. The Committee was satisfied that the required notices had been duly served on Ms Vitkunaite in accordance with the Rules and that the correct procedure leading to the Registrar's erasure decision had been followed. The remaining consideration for the Committee was therefore whether the Registrar's decision to erase should be allowed to stand.
48. The Committee recognised that the CPD requirement is a mandatory statutory requirement which applies to all registered dental professionals. Compliance is important in helping to ensure patient safety and in maintaining wider public confidence in the profession so as to meet the overarching objective of the GDC under Section 1 of the Act. The Committee noted the personal circumstances Ms Vitkunaite outlined in her appeal, [PRIVATE.] However, the Committee was not satisfied that this was a

sufficient and satisfactory reason for Ms Vitkunaite not to comply with her CPD requirements.

49. Therefore, having regard to all the circumstances, the Committee determined that there were no grounds on which this appeal should be allowed. Ms Vitkunaite had failed to demonstrate that she was compliant with her obligations under the CPD Rules. The decision of the Registrar to erase her name was reached correctly in accordance with the procedural requirements of the Rules and following repeated reminders to Ms Vitkunaite of her obligations under the CPD Rules and the importance of compliance in order to maintain continued registration.
50. This appeal was accordingly dismissed.
51. Unless Ms Vitkunaite exercises her right of appeal to the court, the erasure decision will take effect upon the expiry of the 28-day appeal period. It will then be open to Ms Vitkunaite to apply for the restoration of her registration if she meets the CPD and other requirements for restoration.
52. This will be confirmed to Ms Vitkunaite in writing.
53. That concludes this determination.