

**BEFORE THE FITNESS TO PRACTISE COMMITTEE
OF THE GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL**

GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL

IO(09)02

AND

SABEEN KHAN (01-24690)

**DETERMINATION OF A 3RD REVIEW OF AN INTERIM ORDER
23 MARCH 2011**

The Fitness to Practise Committee reviewed an Interim Order for the suspension of Sabeen Khan for a period of 12 months made by the Council on 3 August 2009. The order was extended by the High Court on 22 July 2010 for a period of 12 months. The order has been reviewed on the 19 January 2010 and the 8th of October 2010.

Mrs. Khan was not present for good reason but was represented by Mr. Toomey.

The allegations in this case arise because on 6th June 2009 the Registrant reported to an optical practice where another Registrant "A" had been booked to perform a session of locum duties as a registered optometrist. The Registrant claimed that registrant A was unavailable due to sickness and that she was a registered optometrist and could substitute for him. She undertook Registrant A's duties and examined 19 patients, signing GOS and other forms using Registrant A's details. She claimed payment of £300. Her statements were false. At that time the Registrant only had student registration and was not entitled to call herself an optometrist or perform unsupervised sight tests.

As a consequence, an investigation followed and further allegations have arisen based on the Registrant's failures to disclose, when required, cautions and a previous conviction for theft in various application forms, made and signed by her.

These allegations, if proved, involve findings of dishonesty over a period of time.

The Committee has reconsidered the need for an interim order. This Committee considers that the alleged conduct on the 6th of June 2009, if proved, indicates that the Registrant exposed 19 members of the public to risk. This allegation involves the Registrant deliberately undertaking practice at a time when she was not qualified and, presumably, would not have been insured. Furthermore, her conduct, if proved,

demonstrates a flagrant disregard for the system of professional regulation. It is not in the public interest for someone to remain in unrestricted practice when there is a serious issue about her commitment to complying with the system of registration.

The allegations that she has persistently failed to disclose, when asked, important matters about her history is also a cause for concern.

The Committee notes that the Registrant does not oppose the continuation of the order.

The Committee has concluded that it is both necessary for the protection of the public, and is otherwise in the public interest, for the interim order of suspension to continue unchanged.

Further the Committee is concerned at the delay that has already occurred in this case and has concluded that these allegations should be heard as soon as is possible. The Committee is keen that the substantive hearing in this matter should be heard before the expiry of the High Court period of extension. The Committee understands that this can be accommodated in the current hearings calendar.

Chairman of the Committee: Francesca Jones

Signed _____

Date 23 March 2011