

## ON PAPERS

### Registrations Appeal Committee Registrations Appeal

23 April 2026

**Name:** MOLNAR, Nikoletta

**Case number:** CAS-212327-Q0F6T8

---

**General Dental Council:** Noranne Griffith, IHLPS

**Appellant:** Unrepresented

---

**Outcome:** Appeal Dismissed

---

**Committee members:** Jill Crawford (Chair and Lay Member)  
Gill Jones (Dentist Member)  
Emma Haywood (Dental Care Professional Member)

**Legal adviser:** Paul Moulder

**Professional Adviser:** Malcolm Smith

**Committee Secretary:** Kate Anderson

---

1. This was an appeal meeting before the Registration Appeals Committee (RAC). The hearing was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams
2. This Registrations Appeal Committee (RAC) convened in accordance with the 'General Dental Council (Registration Appeals) Rules 2006' ('the Appeal Rules'). The issue on appeal was whether Ms Molnar demonstrates the requisite knowledge and skill to practise as a member of the dental profession under the title of Dental Hygienist, whether by virtue of her qualification under section 36C(4A) or in accordance with the requirements of section 36C(4)(b) of the Dentists Act 1984 (the "Act").
3. Neither party was present at today's meeting, following notification from the GDC that the appeal could be conducted on the papers.
4. The meeting took place via Microsoft teams.

### **Preliminary matters**

#### **Decision to conduct the appeal in the absence of Ms Molnar and on the papers**

5. The Committee took into account that the GDC's acknowledgement of Ms Molnar's appeal, dated 12 August 2025, informed Ms Molnar that the appeal would take place at a hearing, although she could request for her appeal to be considered on the papers within 28 days of the date of the letter. The Committee noted that Ms Molnar had sent an email to the GDC on 21 August 2025, requesting that her appeal be held on the papers only. The Registrar did not oppose the appeal being dealt with on the papers.
6. The Committee noted that Ms Molnar had not responded to any further correspondence from this date, however it was satisfied that proper process had been followed and that she had been informed that she would be waiving her opportunity to be asked questions by a Professional Adviser. Given Ms Molnar's lack of further response to the GDC since the request for the appeal to be considered on the papers, the Committee was satisfied that she was unlikely to attend a hearing and was content to proceed on the papers.
7. A convening notice with notification of this appeal meeting was sent to Ms Molnar by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 17 March 2026 in accordance with Rule 5 of the Registration Appeal Rules.
8. The Committee noted that the bundle of documents and case summary that the Committee would be considering were sent to Ms Molnar by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 8 April 2026.
9. The Committee was satisfied that the convening notice and bundle of documents had been sent, and noted that there was Royal Mail track and trace receipts proving that they had been delivered and signed for by 'MOLNAR' on 18 March 2026 and 9 April 2026 respectively.
10. The Committee was satisfied that it was appropriate to consider today's appeal in the absence of the parties and on the papers.

#### **Legal framework and background**

11. The Committee had regard to the legal framework and factual background to this appeal, as set out below and in the written case summary provided by the GDC dated 7 April 2026.
12. It is noted that Ms Molnar’s application for registration was made under Section 36C of the Act. Sections 36C(1) to (2) and (4) to (6) of the Act, as they were at the material time, stated as follows:

***The Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) (‘the Act’)***

*(1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, a person shall be entitled to be registered under a particular title in the dental care professionals register if he satisfies the registrar—*

*(a) of matter A or C, and*

*(b) of matter D.*

*(2) Matter A is that the person holds a qualification or qualifications approved by the Council under section 36D(2) in relation to the profession, or class of members of a profession, to which the title applies.*

*(4) Matter C is that the person—*

*(a) holds a qualification or qualifications granted by an institution or institutions outside the United Kingdom relevant to the profession complementary to dentistry, or class of members of such a profession, to which the title applies (in this section referred to as “relevant qualifications”); and*

*(b) has satisfied the Council that he has the requisite knowledge and skill to practise as a member of the profession or class to which the title applies.*

*(4A) Subsection (4)(b) does not apply to a person whose application for registration is made in reliance on a relevant qualification that—*

*(a) was granted in a relevant European State, and*

*(b) demonstrates, in the opinion of the Council, a comparable level of knowledge and skill to that demonstrated by a qualification approved (or qualifications together approved) in respect of the same profession or class under section 36D(2).*

*(5) For the purpose of establishing whether a person has the requisite knowledge and skill for the purposes of subsection (4)(b), the Council—*

*(a) shall take into account all that person's relevant qualifications, and all relevant knowledge or experience, wherever acquired, and*

*(b) may determine that a person must perform to the satisfaction of the Council in any test or assessment specified in the determination.*

*(6) Matter D is—*

*(a) the person’s identity;*

*(aa) that he has the necessary knowledge of English;*

*(b) that he is of good character; and*

(c) that he is in good health, both physically and mentally.

13. Ms Molnar submitted an application form for registration as a Dental Hygienist in the UK dated 27 February 2024 under section 36C of the Act, which was received on 1 March 2024.
14. Ms Molnar's application for registration is made under Matter C. Ms Molnar is primarily relying on her Bachelor's Degree in Health Care and Disease Prevention obtained in Hungary in 2020.

#### First Panel Assessment of application

15. Three assessors formed the first Assessment Panel on 17 October 2024 and conducted an assessment of Ms Molnar's application.
16. Having considered the application, the Panel recommended that Ms Molnar be refused registration under the title of Dental Hygienist. The Panel identified a number of deficiencies in her primary dental qualification. The Panel requested confirmation from Ms Molnar's university that she was taught to deliver dental block injections. The Panel also requested a recent professional reference in respect of a number of learning outcomes, a CPD on indices and a self-reflection on the "*Healthy Gums Do Matter toolkit 2019*".
17. The Registrar relied on the Panel's recommendation and under cover of an email of 21 October 2024, sent a letter to Ms Molnar with the assessment outcome for her application, identifying the deficiencies in her training and her professional experience. Ms Molnar was informed that she had not satisfied the Registrar that she had the requisite knowledge and skill to practice as a Dental Hygienist but that if she had new or additional information to address the identified deficiencies this would be considered by the Registrar if submitted within 28 days, by 18 November 2024. She was also informed of her right of appeal.

#### Correspondence

18. Ms Molnar stated in an email of 22 October 2024 to the Council that apart from "*block anaesthesia*", which was not "*part of [her] degree*", all the learning outcomes identified as deficient were addressed during her university course, and that she had already provided a course syllabus detailing the competencies covered on her degree along with an additional letter signed by the University Dean stating that the syllabus reflects what she was taught. Ms Molnar queried whether she would need to take a course on anaesthesia and indicated that if her university course training was insufficient, she may be able to return to Hungary for a "*week or so to obtain the necessary experience and provide documentation to demonstrate my proficiency in the missing areas*".
19. On 31 October 2024, the Council caseworker, having consulted the assessors, responded by email with further guidance.
20. On 22 November 2024, Ms Molnar provided a self-reflection in respect of the "*Healthy Gums Do Matter toolkit 2019*" and CPD evidence.
21. On 6 December 2024, the Vice Dean of Education of the University of Szeged provided further information on the clinical training and competencies covered in Ms Molnar's degree programme.

#### Reassessment of application by second Panel

22. Three assessors formed a further Panel on 10 April 2025 and conducted a further assessment of Ms Molnar's updated application for registration as a Dental Hygienist. The additional material referred to above was provided to the Panel along with the original decision letter and email correspondence between Ms Molnar and Council caseworker.
23. Having considered the application, the Panel recommended that Ms Molnar be refused registration under the title of Dental Hygienist. The Panel noted that no professional reference had been provided confirming clinical competency in respect of certain of the learning outcomes as previously requested.

#### Correspondence

24. On 14 May 2025, Ms Molnar replied to confirm that administering a dental block is not within the scope of practice of Dental Hygienists in Hungary and therefore was not taught during her studies. She indicated she was open to completing a relevant course and followed up on 20 May to indicate a relevant course was scheduled for the end of June.
25. On 29 May and 6 June 2025, Ms Molnar queried what type of course / training she could complete in respect of dental block injections. She gave no further information about a course in June.
26. On 13 June 2025, the Council caseworker apologised for the delay in replying, confirmed receipt of a professional reference from Ms Molnar, and indicated that her application would again be sent for assessment.

#### Reassessment of application by third Panel

27. Three assessors formed a further Assessment Panel and performed a reassessment by email between 8-21 July 2025. The Panel were provided with the professional reference submitted by Ms Molnar and a letter from a Dr Arpad Szabo dated 20 May 2025. This reference detailed that Ms Molnar had taken a short clinical internship at a dental practice in Hungary from 2 January to 7 February 2025.
28. The Panel did not recommend that Ms Molnar be granted registration under the title of Dental Hygienist. The Panel noted that it remained the case that there was no evidence of Ms Molnar's competency in administering dental blocks.
29. The Registrar wrote to Ms Molnar with the decision refusing registration on 21 July 2025. The reasons for the decision were set out in the letter. She was informed that she had not satisfied the Registrar that she has the requisite knowledge and skill to practise as a dental hygienist.
30. The letter advised the Ms Molnar of her right to appeal.

#### Notice of Appeal

31. On 2 May 2025, the Council received a Notice of Appeal ("NOA") from Ms Molnar in which she confirmed her wish to appeal the decision of 3 April 2025 to refuse her registration in the dental care professionals register as a dental hygienist, and she also made a complaint.
32. Within the NOA, in support of her appeal the Ms Molnar stated that:

- a. The reference from Dr Szabo described her clinical competence and it was unreasonable for, “any clinician to structure a 100-page document itemising every GDC outcome in bureaucratic language”;
- b. She had submitted a fully detailed academic curriculum, supported by UK based CPD evidence, demonstrating she met all the required learning outcomes;
- c. The subjects taught on her course included theoretical and practical training, assessed in clinical contexts;
- d. She, “felt discriminated against for being a qualified professional trained outside of the UK” and the application process feels unfair;
- e. Her queries - in respect of courses for dental block injections - had not been answered.

33. In the supporting material the Ms Molnar included her degree certificate and diploma supplement and a further version of the credit verification and course syllabus.

#### Committee’s consideration and decision

34. The Committee had regard to all the documentary evidence which Ms Molnar had provided in support of her appeal.
35. The Committee also had regard to the written submissions of the GDC. The GDC’s position in response to the appeal is that the registrar was entitled to refuse registration on the basis of the panel’s assessment. This was on the basis that Ms Molnar’s qualification ‘*was not considered by the Council to demonstrate a comparable level of knowledge and skill to that demonstrated by an approved UK dental hygienist qualification, in particular, because of the lack of training in respect of administering dental blocks*’. The GDC also submitted that the professional reference provided on 20 May 2025 did not ameliorate matters as ‘*it was not sufficiently detailed – indeed it is brief and covers a very short period of practice (just over one month) - and the position regarding administering dental blocks was unchanged.*’
36. The Committee accepted the advice of the Professional Adviser.
37. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.
38. Pursuant to paragraph 4(8) of Schedule 4A of the Act, upon hearing the appeal, the Committee may:
  - a. dismiss the appeal;
  - b. allow the appeal and quash the decision appealed against;
  - c. substitute for the decision appealed against any other decision which could have been made by the Registrar; or
  - d. Remit the case to the Registrar to dispose of in accordance with the directions of the Committee.
39. The Professional Adviser advised the Committee to consider all the documents Ms Molnar has submitted in order to make a decision on her appeal application. He advised that to date there are a number of learning outcomes that have not been addressed. He advised that the evidence before the Committee suggested that Ms Molnar had never placed an inferior block, which falls within the scope of practice of a Dental Hygienist in the UK. He advised the Committee to consider whether the CPD that Ms Molnar had undertaken in gaining the title of a Dental Nurse could be relevant. He also advised the Committee to consider whether the professional reference of 20 May 2025 satisfies it that Ms Molnar has the requisite knowledge and skill.

40. The Committee considered whether Ms Molnar has the requisite knowledge required to be registered as a dental hygienist in the UK. In doing so, the Committee considered the learning outcome deficiencies identified by previous Registration Assessment Panels against Ms Molnar's dental experience, together with the evidence provided by the Appellant.
41. The Committee noted that Ms Molnar had not provided any new evidence since the previous Assessment Panel's decision. The previous Panel had requested a considerable list of additional evidence including a detailed professional work reference, and whilst a reference was provided it did not satisfy the Committee of her knowledge and skill in relation to the outstanding learning outcomes identified by the previous Panel. The Committee also noted that Ms Molnar had not been in contact with the GDC since August 2025, neither to provide any more evidence nor correspond in relation to this meeting.
42. The Committee considered the information provided on the course that Ms Molnar had completed in Hungary, and was satisfied that she had studied elements of Dental Hygiene that would mean she had some of the knowledge required. However, it noted that there was little information or evidence in relation to the clinical skills that she may have developed during this time. It noted that there was very little clinical work with patients evidenced in the documents Ms Molnar previously provided.
43. The Committee noted that Ms Molnar had told the previous Assessment Panel that she had booked a course to achieve the learning outcome related to analgesia, but there was no evidence as to whether she had completed this. It considered that this was a knowledge and skill required of a Dental Hygienist in the UK, and this Committee has no information before it to indicate that Ms Molnar has this requisite knowledge and skill.
44. The Committee considered the learning outcome deficiencies identified by the previous Assessment Panel and did not consider that there was any evidence to suggest that these had been remedied or that Ms Molnar had the knowledge and skill required.
45. Having taken into consideration all the evidence and written submissions presented to it, the Committee is not persuaded that Ms Molnar has demonstrated that she has the requisite knowledge and skill, whether by virtue of her qualification or otherwise, that she is suitable for registration as a Dental Hygienist. The Committee was not satisfied that it had received further evidence at this appeal to demonstrate that Ms Molnar has now met the outstanding learning outcomes identified by the Assessment Panels.
46. Therefore, the Committee has decided to dismiss Ms Molnar's appeal.

### **Right of appeal**

47. Ms Molnar may appeal against this decision to the relevant court in accordance with paragraph 6 of Schedule 4A to the Act.
48. That concludes this determination.