PUBLIC HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee
Review Hearing

21 October 2026

Name:	STAMOULIS, Athanasios
Registration number:	80390
Case number:	CAS-205058-N7G7S1

General Dental Council:	Not present Georgina Mayles of IHLPS
Registrant:	Not present Unrepresented

Fitness to practise:	Impaired by reason of misconduct
Outcome:	Suspended indefinitely

Committee members:	Martin Isherwood	(DCP) (Chair)
	Helen Eatherton	(Lay)
	Sulaman Anwar	(Dentist)
Legal adviser:	Alexander Coleman	
Committee Secretary:	Paul Carson	

---

1. This is a resumed hearing pursuant to Section 27C of the Dentists Act 1984 ('the Act') to review the suspension of Mr Stamoulis's registration.

2. This case (reference number: CAS-205058) was considered at the same hearing as another, separate case which has also given rise to a substantive direction of suspension for Mr Stamoulis. That case bears the reference number CAS-193787. Separate consideration has been given to each case, and separate determinations have been produced. This determination relates solely to the case bearing the reference number CAS-205058.

3. Mr Stamoulis was neither present nor represented at this hearing, which was conducted remotely using Microsoft Teams.

4. In its written submissions, the General Dental Council (GDC) requested that the hearing proceed in the absence of the parties and that the case be reviewed on the papers. Its position is that Mr Stamoulis is not engaging in these proceedings, that his fitness to practise continues to be impaired and that a direction for indefinite suspension should now be given.

5. There was no record before the Committee of any response or engagement from Mr Stamoulis regarding his attendance or otherwise at this hearing.

6. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser on the requirements of service and proceeding in absence.

Decision on Service of the Notice of Hearing

7. The Committee first considered whether notice of the hearing had been served on Mr Stamoulis in accordance with Rules 28 and 65 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules'). The Notice of Hearing ('the notice') was sent to him at his registered address on 1 September 2026 by both first class post and Special Delivery. Royal Mail 'Track and Trace' confirms that the Special Delivery item was delivered on 2 September 2026, signed for under the name "STAMOULIS".

8. A link to download a copy of the notice had also been sent to Mr Stamoulis by email on 1 September 2026.

9. The Committee was satisfied that the notice contained the information required under Rule 28 of the Rules, including the time, date and (remote) venue of this hearing; and that it had been sent in accordance with Rule 50 by virtue of its being posted to his registered address.

Decision on Proceeding in the Registrant's Absence

10. The Committee next considered whether to exercise its discretion under Rule 54 of the Rules to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Stamoulis. The Committee approached the issue of proceeding in absence with the utmost care and caution.

11. The Committee was satisfied that the GDC had made all reasonable efforts to send notice of this hearing to Mr Stamoulis. The GDC had also sent the notice to him by email as a downloadable link and followed this up with emails on 1, 7 and 13 October 2026. There is no record before the Committee of any response from Mr Stamoulis. On 13 October 2026 the GDC also attempted to contact him by telephone but there was no answer.

12. Having regard to all the circumstances, including Mr Stamoulis's prior history of non-engagement, the Committee determined that he had voluntarily absented himself from this hearing and that he had waived his right to attend and/or be represented at the hearing. There was nothing to suggest to the Committee that adjourning the hearing today would make his attendance or engagement any more likely in the near future.

13. Given the need for the expeditious disposal of proceeding and the pending expiry of the current period of suspension, the Committee determined that it would be fair and in the public interest to proceed with the hearing in his absence. The Committee further determined that it would be appropriate to accede to the GDC's request that the case be reviewed on the papers.

Background

14. In June 2024, the Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) found Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of misconduct in relation to his care and treatment of a patient in April 2022. The June 2024 PCC summarised its finding of misconduct as follows:

> *"…[The Committee] was of the view that the failings in this case are serious and the Committee concluded that Mr Stamoulis' conduct was a significant departure from the standards expected of a registered dental professional. In considering the gravity of Mr Stamoulis' departures from the GDC's Standards, the Committee took into account the opinion of the expert witness in this case, Mr Bateman for the GDC. Mr Bateman opined that Patient A had a high caries risk and active caries. There was a strong risk of caries progression leading to pain and potentially loss of teeth as well as new carious lesions going undetected. Mr Bateman was of the view that Mr Stamoulis had failed to provide all treatment options, discuss the risks and benefits, treat Patient A's UL8 and LL7 and failed to take bitewing radiographs as clinically indicated fell far below the standard expected of a competent Registrant.*
>
> *The Committee noted that the factual findings in this case included clinical failings by Mr Stamoulis in relation to one patient during one appointment. It accepted the*

opinion evidence of Mr Bateman and considered that these failings concern fundamental aspects of dentistry and directly impacted upon the overarching issue of patient safety and that Mr Stamoulis' failures fell far below the standards. The Committee was satisfied that the failures concern basic and fundamental obligations of a competent dentist and it was of the view that the findings amount to misconduct."

15. In finding Mr Stamoulis' fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of misconduct, the June 2024 PCC concluded that he had not provided any evidence of insight or remediation. It found his fitness to practise to be impaired on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. It directed that his registration be suspended for a period of 6 months with a review.

16. The suspension was reviewed by the PCC on 18 December 2024. That reviewing Committee determined that Mr Stamoulis' fitness to practise remained impaired with on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. It directed that the period of suspension be extended by 7 months with a review.

17. The PCC again reviewed the suspension on 17 July 2025. It found that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise continued to be impaired on both public protection and wider public interest grounds and directed that the suspension of his registration be extended by a further period of 9 months with a review.

18. The suspension was last reviewed by the PCC on 29 April 2026 who found that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise continued to be impaired on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. In its determination, it stated:

"*The Committee took into account the background of the case and the context in which the misconduct occurred, which was when Mr Stamoulis's registration was subject to conditions in respect of the other case against him (ref: ref: CAS-193787). The Committee also considered the findings of the previous PCC in July 2025, which considered the documentation provided by Mr Stamoulis at the time and determined that he continued to demonstrate a lack of insight and that there were shortcomings in his remediation evidence. That PCC made recommendations to Mr Stamoulis of further documents he could submit to a future reviewing Committee and the GDC reminded Mr Stamoulis of this in an email to him in October 2025. However, the Committee has received no further documentation from Mr Stamoulis since the previous review hearing. The Committee has received no evidence to show that Mr Stamoulis has fully reflected on his misconduct and that he understands the gravity of it and the impact it had on the patient involved and public confidence in the profession. Neither has the Committee received any evidence, such as a PDP, evidence of CPD courses undertaken or evidence of any learning undertaken, to demonstrate that the clinical concerns have been fully remedied.*

The Committee was mindful that the burden was on Mr Stamoulis to demonstrate to this Committee that his fitness to practise is no longer impaired. The Committee, however, has determined that he has not successfully discharged that burden. Mr Stamoulis has not attended the hearing and has not meaningfully engaged with the GDC since the previous review hearing in July 2025.

In conclusion, the Committee determined that owing to his lack of insight and remediation, there remained a risk of repetition of the misconduct found, which would put the public at risk if a finding of impairment were not made. Accordingly, the Committee determined that Mr Stamoulis's fitness to practise remained impaired on public protection grounds.

The Committee also determined that a finding of impairment was required in the public interest. The Committee considered that the misconduct found related to basic and fundamental aspects of dentistry, which has not been remedied. The Committee determined, therefore, that a finding of impairment was required to maintain public confidence in the profession and to promote and uphold proper professional standards."

19. The April 2026 PCC directed that the suspension extended by a further period of 6 months with a review. In directing the review, the April 2026 PCC stated: *"…the Committee recommends that Mr Stamoulis provides the information outlined by the PCC in July 2025 for a future reviewing Committee to consider:*

- *'Your attendance at the review hearing;*
- *A focused, concise and personal reflective statement which demonstrates that you have a full understanding of the impact your actions have had on Patient A and Patient B and on public confidence in the profession, and how you intend to change your practice in the future to prevent any repetition of the concerns;*
- *A detailed PDP addressing the concerns arising in 2022;*
- *Targeted CPD relevant to the clinical risks identified; and*
- *Evidence of having kept your clinical knowledge and skills up to date…'*

The resumed hearing 21 October 2026

20. It is the role of the Committee today to undertake the review directed by the April 2026 PCC. The Committee had regard to the GDC's written submission for this review and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

21. Mr Stamoulis has provided none of the reflective or remedial evidence recommended by the April 2026 PCC. He has not otherwise provided any evidence of insight, reflection or remediation. He has not attended this hearing and has not otherwise engaged in this review process. The Committee today is in no different a position to the PCC in April 2026 and to the earlier PCC's. There is a continued pattern of non-engagement by Mr Stamoulis and a sustained failure by him to attempt to demonstrate

insight and remediation, notwithstanding the repeated opportunities which have been afforded to him. In the Committee's judgment, he shows a lack of respect to the Committee and the GDC.

22. In the continued absence of any engagement from Mr Stamoulis, the Committee determined that his fitness to practise continues to be impaired by reason of misconduct on both public protection and wider public interest grounds. The Committee therefore considered what further action, if any, to take in respect of his registration. The Committee determined that the continued restriction of his registration remains necessary for the protection of the public and to maintain public confidence in the profession.

23. There was nothing to suggest that conditions of practice could be formulated which would be workable, measurable and proportionate given Mr Stamoulis's continued lack of engagement. The Committee was therefore satisfied that the suspension of his registration remains necessary and proportionate. There was nothing to suggest to the Committee that Mr Stamoulis is likely to re-engage and demonstrate remediation and reflection within the next 12 months (the maximum period of suspension the Committee can direct).

24. Having regard to Mr Stamoulis's history of non-engagement and his repeated failure to provide any meaningful evidence of remediation and insight, the Committee determined that the indefinite suspension of his registration is now appropriate.

25. Accordingly, the Committee directs that Mr Stamoulis's registration be suspended indefinitely.