

PUBLIC HEARING**Registration Appeals Committee
(Registration Appeal Hearing)****20 July 2026****Name:** HASSAN, Waad Gamal Mohamed Moursi**Case number:** CAS-215843-T0Q1V8

General Dental Council: Mr Tom Stevens , Counsel
Instructed by Lowri Hopkins, ILAS**Registrant:** Present and unrepresented

Outcome: Appeal dismissed

Committee members: Helen Wagner (Chair, Lay Member)
Nicola Jordan (Dentist Member)
Emma Haywood (DCP Member)**Legal Adviser:** Nicola Bircher**Committee Secretary:** Jamie Barge

Miss Hassan,

1. This is a Registration Appeals Committee hearing. The hearing is being conducted remotely by Microsoft Teams video-link.
2. The hearing is being held in accordance with the terms of the *General Dental Council (Registration Appeals) Rules Order of Council 2006*, pursuant to Schedule 4A of the *Dentists Act 1984 (as amended)* ('the Dentists Act').
3. The purpose of this hearing has been for the Committee to consider your appeal against the decision of the GDC's Registrar that you are not eligible for registration on the Dentists Register ('the Register') as a Dentist.
4. You are representing yourself at these proceedings. Mr Tom Stevens, Counsel, appears on behalf of the Registrar.

Legal framework and background

5. The Committee had regard to the legal framework and factual background to this appeal, as set out in the written case summary provided by the GDC dated 26 June 2026, and as outlined by Mr Stevens in his opening submissions.

Application to join ORE candidate list

6. You submitted an application to join the ORE candidate list which was received by the Council on 19 May 2025. This Appeal is not an appeal from the ORE Application; however, it is relevant to the context of this appeal. In order to satisfy the Council that you had the necessary knowledge of English in accordance with Section 15(3)(ba), you submitted a document titled 'IELTS Test Report Form'. IELTS is one way that an applicant can demonstrate their knowledge of English, and in most circumstances no further evidence in support of English language is required. The Council's registration team sought to verify your certificate with the British Council. They received an email from the British Council's IELTS Verification Team stating, "*After careful review and consideration of IELTS databases, we can confirm the Test Report Form you have provided for this case does not match our records. This is a counterfeit TRF and should be disregarded*".
7. On 17 June 2025, the Council emailed you requesting an explanation for the IELTS certificate. This email stated that the certificate was not authentic. You followed this email on the same day with a telephone call to the GDC and were provided with advice to respond as per the email.
8. On 25 June 2025 and 10 July 2025, the Council emailed you following up the email sent on 17 June 2025 requesting an explanation by 17 July 2025 as the Council had not received a response from you. On 22 July 2025, the Council sent a letter to you stating that you are currently not eligible for the ORE as you had not satisfied the registrar that you had the necessary knowledge of English to practise as a member of the profession based on the information provided by IELTS and the lack of response from you.

Temporary Registration – Dentist Application

9. On 28 January 2026, you submitted a temporary registration application to the Council via post. This application gives rise to the Appeal before this Committee. Within this application, you submitted a new IELTS Test Report Form. On 9 February 2026, the Council wrote to you via email acknowledging your request to join the Dentist register. The Council again informed you that the

previous IELTS certificate provided as part of the former ORE Application was counterfeit, requesting an explanation.

10. You subsequently wrote to the Council via email providing a response regarding the counterfeit IELTS certificate provided. You stated that at the time of the previous correspondence you were unaware of the issues with the documents provided. Additionally, you stated that when you were informed that the Council could not verify your documents, you were unsure of the next steps. Lastly you stated that you were unable to find a solution or a reason as to why there was an issue with your documents and decided to retake the test when you were in the UK to ensure the verification was easier in your next application. Various email communications were subsequently exchanged regarding this process.

11. On 12 February 2026 the caseworker referred the matter internally to her manager, due to the issues surrounding the good character and English language. It is noted that the application under consideration at the time was your application for *Temporary Registration*, however, this included reference to the counterfeit IELTS result, previously submitted as part of the ORE Application. On 17 February 2026, the casework manager refused the application.

12. On 19 February 2026, the Council wrote to you confirming that the Registrar has decided that you were not currently eligible for registration as a dentist as you had not satisfied the Registrar that you were of good character. The Council set out the reasons for the decision, which primarily relate to the submission of the counterfeit IELTS results in the ORE Application. The Council also raised that no response was received when information was requested by email on 17 June 2025, 25 June 2025 and 10 July 2025. This was despite you phoning the Council on 17 June 2025, at which time the Council advised you of the email correspondence of 17 June 2025, and requested a response to that email. Due the absence of any response the ORE application was closed on 22 July 2025.

13. The Council then note that the Temporary Registration application was received with a new, legitimate IELTS Certificate. As the issues pertaining to the Counterfeit IELTS certificate were outstanding, the Council wrote to you on 09 February 2026, and 11 February 2026 seeking clarification.

14. Taking into account all of the evidence submitted, the Council concluded that you had not satisfied the Council that you are of good character.

Your appeal

15. On 11 March 2026, the Council received a NOA ("Notice of Appeal") from you in respect of the Registrar's decision.

16. Within the NOA, you provided a two-page covering letter in which you stated that you were appealing the decision not to register you as a Dentist because:

- *ORE Application and IELTS submissions – 29 May 2025*

- You personally sat the exam, and you received what you believed to be an official Test Report Form. You submit that you did not create, alter or falsify the document, and you had no knowledge that the certificate would later be described as counterfeit. You stated you had no intention to mislead the GDC.
- When you learned that the certificate did not match the IELTS records you were shocked and any irregularity in the issuance of the certificate was out of your control.

- You explained that you had previously submitted the same IELTS certificate to the Council and the earlier application was returned due to an unrelated administrative issue and no issues were raised regarding your IELTS certificate.
- *Phone call and clarification – 17 June 2025*
- You explained that you did not understand the email received from the Council when asked to verify your IELTS certificate. Due to this you called the Council the same day to seek clarification and guidance as to what you should include in your written response, however you were told you were unable to speak to the caseworker.
 - You stated that during the call you were not informed that your IELTS certificate was described as 'counterfeit' and only understood that the certificate could not be verified and that further information was required.
 - You detailed that at the time you did not appreciate that your integrity was being questioned, that your certificate was being described as counterfeit and that you believed the matter to be administrative.
 - You recognised that regardless of your uncertainty and misunderstanding of the seriousness you should have followed up immediately in writing to clarify the matter. You further states that your failure to respond to the Council was a serious error of judgement, and not dishonesty.
- *Email correspondence and clarification regarding "spam"*
- You accepted that in your response in February 2026 you stated that you had not seen the relevant emails because they had gone to your spam folder. You clarified that you did receive and read the initial email dated 17 June 2025 which prompted you to contact the Council via telephone. However, you did not see the subsequent emails.
 - You further clarified that during this period that you were relocating to a new city, beginning new employment, arranging accommodation therefore managing a high volume of communications. You provided supporting documents to further support the above claims.
 - You claim that due to the above and further large volumes of communication due to your employment onboarding arrangements, the subsequent Council emails were automatically or inadvertently directed to your spam folder and thus the emails were not visible in your primary inbox and did not see or appreciate their content.
 - You further stated that when you previously referred to the emails going to spam, you were explaining that you had not seen the later correspondence (after the email dated 17 June 2025). You were not suggesting that you had not received any communication.
 - You accept that it was your responsibility to monitor and respond to the Council's correspondence and your failure to identify those emails at the time was an error of judgement during a period of transition and not an attempt to avoid engagement.
- *Response to GDC February – 2026*
- You explained that when you were contacted by the Council again in February 2026 regarding your previous certificate you responded promptly and provided an explanation.
 - You stated that you did not attempt to avoid engagement with the Council nor did you seek to minimise or conceal any issues.

- You believed that your earlier communication reflected your misunderstanding and inexperience with the regulatory process and not dishonesty.
- *Insight and reflection*
 - You recognised that your lack of experience and understanding of the regulatory environment contributed to your failure to respond appropriately with sufficient urgency and that it was a mistake on your part.
 - You stated that this experience has significantly matured your understanding of professional accountability and strengthened your commitment to proactive, transparent engagement with the regulator at all times.
 - You respectfully submit that you pose no ongoing risk to the public or public confidence in the profession.

Today's appeal hearing

17. The Committee heard oral evidence from you, as well as submissions from Mr Stevens and yourself.

18. Mr Stevens opened the GDC's case and provided a background to your appeal application today. He submitted that you made an application for temporary registration on 28 January 2026. Your application was assessed and it was determined that you had not satisfied the GDC that you are of good character. Mr Stevens submitted that issue of good character is the focus of your appeal today. He then stated that as you are intending to give oral evidence under oath, he will hold on to making final submissions until after you have concluded your oral evidence.

Your oral evidence

19. You stated that when you made your application for registration you did not think to check and question the authenticity of the certificate. You have since learnt to do so in future and to take this process more seriously. However, you stated that when you were approached by the GDC about verifying the certificate, you thought it must be down to an administrative checking issue and not that your integrity was being called into question. At that time, you were moving to a different city for a new job and training whilst seeing your father who was unwell. You stated that you didn't have the mental capacity to keep tracking all GDC communications. You stated that some of the GDC emails around June 2025, went to your spam folder and you only became aware of this when you made a temporary registration application in January 2026. You gave reasons why you applied for temporary registration and stated you wanted to take the right and legal way to practise in the United Kingdom. You stated that you do not have any issue with the English language and you can speak it well. You have stated that you have invested time and money and you are equally shocked at the allegations that you had provided a false certificate. Once you knew your integrity was being questioned you fully engaged with the GDC.

20. You stated this process has affected you badly and you have now lost the recent job offer in January 2026 and had to leave the UK. You stated you understand where the GDC is coming from and you respect all rules and regulations. You stated that you are trying to prove your honesty and integrity, and you never knowingly submitted a counterfeit certificate to the GDC. You have since apologised to the GDC and stated that you genuinely did not understand that your integrity was being called into question.

21. During cross examination from Mr Stevens, you explained that in June 2025 you had missed GDC email communications regarding your ORE application as your inbox was inundated and they had gone to your spam email folder. However, Mr Stevens referred to an email you sent to the GDC on 11 February 2026 where you acknowledged previously receiving GDC email correspondence on 17 June 2025. In addition, you were referred to the GDC's initial email sent to you on 9 February 2026, which you had acknowledged, which referred to the authenticity of your recent IELTS certificate. Mr Stevens put it to you that your account of receiving GDC email correspondence had fundamentally changed and you never sought to challenge the IELTS verification process. You stated that what you told GDC on 11 February 2026 was not materially wrong, however, you accept you made a mistake in terms of chronology and engagement, but you maintain you were not aware of the correspondence regarding your integrity being called into question.

22. There were also questions from the Committee, during which you addressed details regarding the provider of your recent IELTS examination.

Closing submissions made by the parties

23. Following your oral evidence, the Committee heard closing submissions from Mr Stevens and yourself.

24. Mr Stevens adopted the written submissions which stated that you have failed to demonstrate that you are of good character as:

You acted in a dishonest manner by:

- a. Submitting to the Council a counterfeit IELTS certificate;
- b. Making a declaration in your ORE Application that the details were true and correct while submitting a counterfeit IELTS certificate;
- c. Failing to provide a credible explanation and/or failing to respond to the Council's queries about the submission of the counterfeit IELTS certificate during your ORE Application;
- d. Failing to provide a credible explanation for the submission of the counterfeit IELTS certificate during your application for temporary registration;
- e. Making contradictory representations to the Council when seeking to provide explanation for the submission of the counterfeit IELTS certificate during the application for temporary registration;
- f. Failing to provide a full and cogent explanation of the origins of the counterfeit IELTS certificate.

25. Mr Stevens submitted that your dishonesty occurred over a protracted period, commencing initially with representations to the Council in your ORE application on 19 May 2025, and further correspondence and representations until 11 March 2026. The Council submits that the evidence shows that the IELTS Test Report Form' bearing Report Number 23SA013961HASW102A is counterfeit. You have not disputed that the certificate is counterfeit. Mr Stevens submitted that you were fully aware of the issues with the IELTS Certificate from the Council's email of 17 June 2025.

26. Mr Stevens submitted that the Council do not accept your submission that you were unaware of the issues arising from the submission of a fraudulent document. Further, the conduct is in contravention of your declaration that the information contained in the application is true and correct. He further submitted that you deliberately disengaged and failed to respond to the Council's correspondence regarding the counterfeit IELTS Certificate. The Council submit that this is inconsistent with your submissions you did not appreciate that your integrity was being questioned, that your certificate was being described as counterfeit, and that you believed the matter to be administrative. In addition, the Council note that following your disengagement with the ORE Registration application from 17 June 2025, the Council received your new Temporary Registration Application as a Dentist around 6 months later, on 28 January 2026.

27. Mr Stevens submitted that the Council reiterates the submission that there is no evidence to support your assertion of mistaken belief that the IELTS Certificate was legitimate, nor does the Council accept that the submission of the fraudulent certificate was outside of your control. The Council submit that your assertion that the certificate was submitted in good faith is disingenuous.

28. Mr Stevens submitted that you only corresponded in relation to the Counterfeit Certificate upon the Council's request and failed to demonstrate candour. Accordingly, Mr Stevens submitted that your appeal should be dismissed.

29. You stated that you have tried to rectify and explain the misunderstanding that has been made by the GDC. You maintain that you had not seen the emails at that time, and there have been no issues raised by your employers regarding your integrity whilst working and living in the UK. You stated that you have learnt a lot since.

The Committee's decision on your appeal

30. The Committee took account of the submissions made by Mr Stevens and your submissions. It accepted the advice of the independent Legal Adviser present at these proceedings.

31. The Committee considered all the evidence presented to it. No further documentary evidence has been provided.

32. The Committee bore in mind that the burden was on you to satisfy it that you are of good character as required by section 17 of the Dentists Act for registration as a Dentist. When considering your appeal, the Committee had sight of the test for dishonesty and the PSA guidance on good character. The Committee was satisfied that, based on all the information before it, your actions in submitting a fraudulent certificate for registration onto the GDC Register were dishonest.

33. The Committee was aware that the integrity of the register is paramount, and that there is a need to ensure that those who are granted registration are deemed to be of good character. The Committee is not satisfied that you have provided an adequate explanation for why you failed to respond a number of GDC email communications over a protracted period of time. It notes that when you were notified by the GDC of your IELTS certificate being non-authentic, you did not seek to immediately challenge its authenticity. In addition, you failed to provide sufficient details of the course provider, how you booked the examination or why you did not revert back to the provider when the GDC questioned the authenticity of the certificate. The Committee considers that all of this information would be important for the purposes of your appeal today.

34. In respect of communications from the GDC, the Committee considers that you have failed to provide adequate explanations for why you had failed to respond to a number of emails from the GDC. It found your oral evidence to be contradictory as to exactly when you were aware of the emails from the GDC. In fact, your explanations you provided today raise further concerns as to your candour. It took into account you were busy at the time with professional and personal matters; however, you have failed to provide a reliable explanation as to your conduct and lack of engagement with the GDC. Accordingly, the Committee did not consider that your oral evidence took matters any further forward in this regard.

35. The Committee therefore considers that when you were notified of the fraudulent certificate by the GDC, your state of mind was such that you made a conscious decision not to respond to the emails from the GDC. The Committee is satisfied the consequence of your dishonest conduct has the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession, as patients and the public have the right to trust that their dentists have properly met the standards required for registration. Further, the Committee could not be satisfied that you would not act in a similar manner if faced with another situation, given the conflicting evidence you gave at this appeal hearing.

36. For all these reasons, the Committee was not satisfied that you have provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that you are of good character as required for registration.

37. Therefore, the Committee has determined to dismiss your appeal.

38. That concludes this hearing.