

ON PAPERS**Registrations Appeal Hearing
CPD Appeal Hearing****14 July 2026****Name:** SEYMOUR, Tiffani Rose**Registration number:** 185083**Case number:** CAS-214296-W6G9F4

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

Outcome: Appeal dismissed

Committee members: Anthony Mole (Chair, lay member)
Sarah Benton (Dentist member)
Stephanie Carter (Dental Care Professional member)**Legal adviser:** Matthew Corrie**Committee Secretary:** Sara Page

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

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 Seymour from the Register for apparent non-compliance with the statutory Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements. The hearing is being 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').
2. The hearing was conducted remotely via Microsoft Teams in line with current GDC practice. Neither party was present at today's hearing, following notification from the GDC that the appeal was to be conducted on the papers.

Preliminary matters

Application for the hearing to be held partly in private

3. At the beginning of the hearing, the Committee considered an application on behalf of the GDC pursuant to Rule 14(1) of the Appeal Rules that that this hearing be held partly in private where reference is made to Mrs Seymour's private and family life.
4. The Committee heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser in this regard. The Committee bore in mind that, as a starting point, hearings should be conducted in public session. However, having regard to the information before it, the Committee was satisfied that the personal interests of Mrs Seymour outweighed the public interest in this case.
5. The Committee was satisfied that the hearing should be held in private when discussing matters relating Mrs Seymour's private and family life and therefore acceded to the GDC's application.

Decision to conduct the appeal in the absence of Mrs Seymour and on the papers

6. 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 Seymour had made no such request.
7. Notification of this appeal was sent to Mrs Seymour by Recorded Delivery and secure email on 12 June 2026 in accordance with Rule 5 of the Registration Appeal Rules.
8. The Committee was satisfied that it was appropriate to consider today's appeal in the absence of either party and on the papers.

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 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.
10. The CPD Rules came into force on the 1 January 2018 and took effect in respect of dental care professionals 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.
12. Mrs Seymour appealed against the Registrar's decision that her CPD is non-compliant because she has failed to provide a compliant CPD record demonstrating that she has met the minimum requirement for the period 1 August 2023 – 31 July 2025.

Case summary

13. The GDC's case in support of its decision was summarised as follows:
14. Mrs Seymour first registered with the General Dental Council ("the Council") as a dental care professional, with the titles of dental nurse on 22 December 2009. In accordance with Rule 1 as set out above, her CPD cycle began on 1 August 2020 and ended on 31 July 2025.
15. On 22 May 2025, the Council sent an email reminder to Mrs Seymour registered email address. This reminder notified Mrs Seymour that her CPD cycle 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 cycle, by 28 August 2025. Mrs Seymour was reminded that she needed to complete the minimum number of hours for her five-year cycle as well as at least ten hours CPD over the last two years. She was advised that if she did not submit a compliant statement before the deadline, her registration may be put at risk. Mrs Seymour was also reminded that she could apply for a 56-day period of grace if she required additional time to be compliant with CPD requirements and had a good reason.
16. On 10 June 2025, the Council sent Mrs Seymour an Annual Renewal Notice letter 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. Mrs Seymour was reminded in this notice that she was required to submit her CPD statement by 28 August 2025, that her CPD cycle was ending on 31 July 2025 and she would need to have completed at least ten hours of CPD over the last two years. Again, the Appellant was reminded that she could apply for a period of grace if she required additional time to complete CPD.

17. Between 12 June and 28 August 2025, Mrs Seymour was sent numerous reminders via different methods of communication reminding her of her CPD requirements.
18. On 25 September, the Council sent a notice under Rule 7 (the “Rule 7 notice”) to Mrs Seymour by recorded delivery stating that records showed she had not completed her CPD submission for the cycle 1 August 2020 – 31 July 2025 by the deadline of 28 August 2025. She was informed that she was required to send her CPD statement by 23 October 2025. On 26 September 2025, a copy of the Rule 7 notice was also sent via email to Mrs Seymour’s registered email address.
19. On 5 November 2025, the Council sent a notice under Rule 6 (the “Rule 6 notice”) to Mrs Seymour by recorded delivery. On 6 November 2025, a copy of the Rule 6 notice was sent via email to Mrs Seymour’s registered email address. The Rule 6 notice stated that although Mrs Seymour had (now) submitted her CPD statement, records showed that she had not declared enough hours to meet the requirement of completing a minimum of ten hours CPD over two consecutive years and that her registration was at risk. The Rule 6 notice stated that she had previously submitted a 2023-2024 annual statement of seven verifiable CPD hours and a 2024-2025 annual statement of zero CPD hours. The Appellant was invited to demonstrate that she had met the ten hours CPD requirement between 1 August 2023-31 July 2025 and to inform the Council of any reasons or exceptional circumstances that meant she was unable to submit a compliant statement by 3 December 2025.
20. On 9 December 2025, the Council sent a notice under Rule 8 (the “Rule 8 notice”) to Mrs Seymour’s registered address by recorded delivery. On 10 December 2025, a copy of the Rule 8 notice was sent via email to Mrs Seymour’s registered email address. The Rule 8 notice confirmed that Mrs Seymour had failed to provide a compliant CPD record demonstrating that she had met the minimum requirement for the period 1 August 2023-31 July 2025, that no evidence of Mrs Seymour’s CPD record or evidence of exceptional personal circumstances which may have prevented her from completing her CPD as required had been provided. Mrs Seymour was informed that as a result, the Registrar was not satisfied she had complied with the Rules and had made the decision to remove her name from the dental care professionals register for non-compliance. Mrs Seymour was notified that unless an appeal was submitted by 6 January 2026, the Registrar’s decision would take effect on 8 January 2026.
21. On 5 January 2026, the Council received a Notice of Appeal (“NOA”) from Mrs Seymour.
22. On 7 January 2026, Mrs Seymour’s CPD evidence was assessed by a Registration Operations Officer. Mrs Seymour was deemed to be non-compliant with her CPD requirements on the basis that:
 - a) she was outstanding ten verifiable CPD hours for 1 August 2023-31 July 2025;
 - b) an activity log had not been provided; and,
 - c) a personal development plan had not been provided.

Mrs Seymour submitted further documentation and on 25 February 2026, Mrs Seymour’s CPD evidence was further assessed by a Registrations Operations Officer. Mrs Seymour was deemed to be non-compliant with her CPD requirements on the basis that:

- a) She was outstanding three verifiable CPD hours for 1 August 2023-31 July 2025;
- b) An activity log had not been provided; and
- c) A personal development plan had not been provided.

Submissions

23. In its written submissions, the GDC submitted that Mrs Seymour is non-compliant with the CPD requirements because she has failed to complete the required ten hours of CPD over a two-year period. It is submitted by the Registrar that Mrs Seymour was reminded on numerous occasions of the need to submit an annual statement, of the requirement to complete ten verifiable CPD hours in each two-year period and that she could apply for a 56-day period of grace if she did not think that she would be compliant with the CPD requirements and had a good reason. It was the GDC's submission that Mrs Seymour has provided no evidence of CPD over the two-year period. As per the GDC's document '*Guidance on the Registrar's Discretion to Erase for CPD non-compliance*', [PRIVATE] CPD hours that are not relevant to the period in question.
24. In Mrs Seymour's NOA, she submitted that [PRIVATE] she had completed 119 hours CPD for the five-year cycle. Mrs Seymour stated that she hoped that her appeal would be considered as she had been registered since 2009 without issue.

Committee's decision and reasons

25. The Committee had regard to the documentary evidence provided today and took account of the written submissions made on behalf of the GDC and those made by Mrs Seymour in her NOA. It heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser regarding the principles to be considered in coming to its decision.
26. The Committee noted that the relevant CPD cycle being considered in this appeal is 1 August 2023 – 31 July 2025. The Committee was satisfied that Mrs Seymour has provided verifiable evidence of seven hours of CPD, leaving a deficit of three outstanding hours. She has not provided her Activity Log or Personal Development Plan to the GDC despite this being requested.
27. The Committee was satisfied that the Rule 6 and Rule 7 notices had been sent in accordance with the Rules. In its consideration of Mrs Seymour's NOA, the Committee referred to '*Guidance on the Registrar's Discretion to Erase for CPD Non-Compliance (February 2024)*' and whether there is any evidence that Mrs Seymour was prevented from completing her required CPD hours due to exceptional personal circumstances which were beyond her control. Whilst the Committee acknowledged her personal circumstances [PRIVATE], it noted that Mrs Seymour continued to work throughout the second year of the relevant CPD cycle and that she had not completed any CPD that year, nor did she provide the documentation requested of her by the GDC in the numerous reminders that were sent to Mrs Seymour. Further, Mrs Seymour did not apply for the 56-day grace period to allow her further time to comply with her CPD requirements.
28. Whilst the Committee was sympathetic to her personal circumstances, there was no evidence before it of exceptional circumstances beyond Mrs Seymour's control that prevented her from having complied with her CPD requirements as a dental care professional.

29. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. The Committee had consideration of its overarching objectives, namely the protection of the public and public interest in ensuring dental professionals comply with all requirements of the enhanced CPD regime. The Committee wished to remind Mrs Seymour that it is open to her to apply for the restoration of her name to the Register upon completion of the required number of CPD hours.
30. Unless Mrs Seymour exercises her right of appeal to the County Court (if based in England or Wales) or the sheriff in whose sherrifdom her 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 Mrs Seymour to apply for the restoration of her name if she meet the CPD and other requirements for restoration.
31. This will be confirmed to Mrs Seymour in writing in accordance with the Act.
32. That concludes this determination.