PRIVATE HEARING

Professional Conduct Committee
Restoration Hearing

5 November 2026

Name:	KAFETZIDIS, Charalampos
Case number:	CAS-180243-G4V7L1

General Dental Council:	Miss Rebecca Vanstone, Counsel. Instructed by Rashidah Conroy, IHLPS
Registrant:	Present and unrepresented

Outcome:	Not restored to the Register

Committee members:	Martin Isherwood (Chair, Dental Care Professional Member) Robin Barber (Dentist Member) Jane Jones (Lay Member)
Legal adviser:	Paul Moulder
Committee Secretary:	Sarah Crewe

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

Mr Kafetzidis,

1. This was a Professional Conduct Committee (PCC) hearing in relation to your application for restoration to the Dentists Register ('the Register') under Section 28 of the Dentists Act 1984 (as amended) ('the Act'). The hearing was conducted remotely via TEAMs.
2. You were unrepresented. Miss Rebecca Vanstone appeared on behalf of the General Dental Council (GDC).

Application for the hearing to be conducted in private

3. Miss Vanstone made an application under Rule 53 of the General Dental Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules 2006 ('the Rules') for the hearing to be conducted in private to protect your private life, on the grounds that the matters before the Committee concern your health.
4. You agreed to the application.
5. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Committee was satisfied that it was appropriate and necessary to protect your private life given that the matters before it concern your health. The Committee therefore granted the application and directed that the hearing be conducted in private. There will be a private and a suitably redacted public version of the determination provided.

Background

6. Your case was considered at a Health Committee hearing on 7 February 2019. That Committee found your fitness to practise to be impaired by reason of misconduct and/or adverse physical health.
7. The matters before that Committee concerned your diagnosis with relevant health conditions, your failure to follow GDC guidance, and your working without satisfying the applicable criteria set by the GDC. [PRIVATE], and that your actions placed the safety of patients at risk.
8. In respect of sanction, the Health Committee directed that your name be erased from the Dentists Register and imposed an order for immediate suspension.
9. You did not appeal the Health Committee's decision and your name was erased from the Register.

Submissions and Oral Evidence

10. In her opening submissions, Miss Vanstone outlined the background to the case that was originally considered by the Health Committee in 2019. This included the medical information presented to that Committee.
11. You gave oral evidence under oath. You outlined your background, including your education and career history. You stated that you cared for your patients, that approximately 95% of them were very grateful, and that you had always tried to put your patients first. You described reaching a level after 15 to 20 years where you were confident and happy with your work, and explained that you genuinely enjoyed dentistry. You explained that during the last two to three years of your practice, you worked with a dental nurse who was also a trained operating theatre nurse.
12. [PRIVATE].
13. [PRIVATE].
14. [PRIVATE].
15. [PRIVATE].

16. [PRIVATE].

17. [PRIVATE].

18. [PRIVATE].

19. [PRIVATE].

20. [PRIVATE].

21. [PRIVATE].

22. [PRIVATE].

23. When asked about your knowledge of GDC standards, you stated that at your 2019 hearing you had not read the standards until you were asked about them, and that you had not really read them since or considered the need to uphold them.

24. [PRIVATE].

25. In relation to your professional development, you stated that you had completed 100 hours of online Continuing Professional Development (CPD) over approximately six weeks, which you described as enjoyable. You explained that while you had previously thought you might want to return to dentistry, that had now changed.

26. You stressed that you had loved and enjoyed your work as a dentist, [PRIVATE].

27. [PRIVATE].

28. In closing submissions, Miss Vanstone invited the Committee to refuse your application for restoration to the Register. She submitted that there was no evidence of any change in your position, no insight into the findings made against you and no relevant remediation.

29. Miss Vanstone referred the Committee to extracts from the original determination and submitted that there was nothing before the Committee to address the matters identified by the Committee in 2019. She submitted that it was clear from your evidence at this hearing that you maintained your position that you did not pose any risk to your patients.

30. Miss Vanstone submitted that the information before the Committee demonstrated a concerning pattern. She referred the Committee to the relevant case law and the factors it would need to consider when determining whether to allow your name to be restored to the Dentists Register.

31. Miss Vanstone submitted that you had not worked in the United Kingdom for seven years and had confirmed that you had not worked abroad during that period. She noted that the CPD you undertook had all been completed within a six-week period and that you had not undertaken a return-to-work course to update your skills or knowledge. She submitted that, accordingly, it was only proper for the Committee to refuse the application.

32. In closing, you told the Committee that you wanted to have your say and put your views forward, although you did not think this would change anything. [PRIVATE]. You said that you understood the Committee was limited in what it could do and had to abide by the GDC Rules. You said that you had considered going to the press but decided that it was not worthwhile.

Committee's Decision

33. The Committee has considered your application for restoration to the Register very carefully. It has considered all the documentary and oral evidence presented to it in this case. It took account of your oral evidence. It has had regard to Miss Vanstone's submissions and your submissions. It also heard and accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

34. The Committee has considered the provisions of Section 28(5) of the Act which governs the requirements for restoration to the Dentists Register. The Committee has reminded itself

that the burden of satisfying the provisions of Section 28(5) falls upon you. Section 28(5) identifies that the Committee, before restoring you to the Register, must be satisfied that you:

- are fit to practise as a dentist;
- meet the requirements of *Section 15(3)* in relation to your identity, that you are of good character, that you have the necessary knowledge of English and are of good health, both physically and mentally;
- meet the requirements of any rules made under *Section 34B* regarding professional training and development;

35. The Committee was aware that it is for you to satisfy it of the matters set out under Section 28(5) of the Act.

36. The Committee also considered the relevant sections of the GDC's *Guidance for the Practice Committee* (*effective January 2026*) which deals with restoration hearings and the matters which Committees dealing with such applications must consider carefully.

37. When considering your application, the Committee also had at the forefront of its mind the overarching objectives of the GDC. These are:

- To protect, promote and maintain the health, safety and well-being of the public;
- To promote and maintain public confidence in the professions regulated under the Act; and
- To promote and maintain proper professional standards and conduct for members of the dental profession.

38. The Committee considered the determination of the Health Committee in 2019, which led to your erasure from the Dentists Register. In particular, that Committee was not satisfied that you had insight or that the misconduct would not be repeated, and identified that you had a deep-seated attitudinal issue, [PRIVATE].

39. In looking at everything that the Committee has seen and heard at this hearing today, it concluded that your position has not changed. You have demonstrated no insight into the seriousness of your misconduct and the risk posed to patients. Your oral evidence today demonstrated that your views and denial of the facts surrounding your 2019 misconduct have become deeply entrenched and are unlikely to change, [PRIVATE]. The Committee also took into account your oral evidence that you have no intention of returning to the United Kingdom and that you wanted one final opportunity to air your views publicly.

40. [PRIVATE].

41. The Committee considered that, while the matters found by the 2019 Committee are capable of remediation, you have not taken steps to remediate them. You have not demonstrated any real insight or remorse in relation to your actions, and the Committee considered that the risk of repetition is high. The Committee acknowledged the CPD hours that you have completed; however, it noted that these were completed within a six-week period, and you have not undertaken any hands-on return-to-practice courses.

42. These matters prevent the Committee from being satisfied that you meet the statutory requirements for restoration under Section 28(5) of the Act, including that you are fit to practise as a dentist and that you meet the requirements of Section 15(3) in relation to being of good health. The Committee also considered that a fully informed member of the public would be shocked and troubled if it were to allow your application for restoration.

43. Accordingly, the Committee has determined to refuse your application for restoration to the Dentists Register.

44. That concludes this determination.