

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

GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL

AND

F(19)16

FRANCISCA GRACIA RUIZ (01-23179)

**DETERMINATION OF A SUBSTANTIVE HEARING
24-25 October & 28-29 October 2019**

Committee Members:

Mr J Kellock – (Chair)
Ms H McEwen – (Lay)
Mr P Curtis – (Lay)
Ms L Gerson – (Optometrist)
Ms L Troy – (Optometrist)

Legal adviser:

Mr D Mason

GOC Presenting Officer:

Ms A Ling

Registrant:

Present and represented

Registrant representative:

Miss H Tighe

Hearings Officer:

Ms A Riaz

Facts found proved:

1a, 1b, 2a, 2c

Facts not found proved:

2b

Misconduct:

Found

Impairment:

Impaired

Sanction:

Suspension for six months - With a review

Immediate order:

No immediate order

DETERMINATION

Applications

Two applications were made on behalf of the Registrant during the course of her case:

1. That the Committee give leave that the Registrant could adduce evidence although the provisions of Rule 29 of the The General Optical Council (Fitness to Practise) Rules Order of Council 2013 (the Rules) had not been complied with in that directions as to disclosure had not been followed;
2. That four witnesses who were to give evidence on behalf of the Registrant should be permitted to do so by video link or telephone.

It was submitted by Miss Tighe, Counsel for the Registrant, that although the time limit for compliance with Rule 29 had not been complied with in relation to witness statements, it was fair to allow the application to admit relevant evidence. She submitted that the General Optical Council (the Council) had been kept informed of progress towards disclosing the Registrant's case throughout and that in relation to three witnesses there had been delay because the statements they produced had to be translated from Spanish to English. There was, it was submitted, no prejudice to the Council.

Miss Ling, Counsel for the Council, said that it was neutral in relation to the applications, although she made submissions that parts of the statement of one of the witnesses were irrelevant as they contained statements of opinion, not fact.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that in relation to the first application it should consider what was fair to both parties and that the issue was whether a fair hearing could still take place.

It accepted his advice in relation to the second application that again it was a matter of fairness to the parties.

The Committee concluded in relation to the first application that the Registrant's representatives had kept the Council informed over the delays and it had not objected. It noted the problems created by the need to have documents translated. It was satisfied that there was no prejudice to the Council and that a fair hearing could still take place. It noted in relation to both applications that there was a serious allegation of dishonesty against the Registrant.

In relation to the second application, the Committee concluded that it was fair to both parties to allow the evidence of four witnesses to be given by video link otherwise the Registrant would not be able to present evidence she wished to rely upon and there was no prejudice to the Council.

The Committee therefore acceded to both applications.

The Committee was concerned that a statement of a witness of fact contained expressions of opinion. Before finally adjudicating upon the objections raised by the Council, it invited the parties to attempt to agree a redacted version of the statement. The parties did so and the Committee accepted the revised version of it.

Allegations

The Council alleges that in relation to you, Francisca Gracia Ruiz (01-23179), a registered Optometrist:

1. *On or around 25 September 2017, attempted to remove and/or removed [redacted] property from the premises without purchasing the items as required, namely:*
 - a. *black ladies trousers; and/or*
 - b. *black cardigan;*

2. *Your actions at 1 (a) and/or (b) above were:*
 - a. *Inappropriate; and/or*
 - b. *Financially motivated; and/or*
 - c. *Dishonest in that you knew you did not purchase the item(s) as required.*

And by virtue of the facts set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of misconduct.

Admissions in relation to the particulars of the allegation

The Registrant admitted particular 1a of the allegation to the extent that she admitted attempting to remove [redacted] property (a pair of black trousers) from its premises.

Background to the allegations

The Registrant has been registered with the General Optical Council as an optometrist since 17 April 2007. She originally worked in optics in Spain before coming to the UK and completing an MSC in optometry between 2002 and 2004. The Registrant was engaged by [redacted] to work as a locum optometrist at its [redacted] store on 25 September 2017 at a branch of [redacted] Opticians. Significantly the [redacted] supermarket and the optician's premises where the Registrant was to work, are separate but near to each other in a shopping centre.

It is common ground that the Registrant did not in fact fulfil that role following an incident involving an allegation that she attempted to remove [redacted] property, a pair of black trousers and a black cardigan, without purchasing them. As a result [redacted] reported what had occurred to the Council which investigated the allegations which resulted in this hearing.

Evidence

The Committee heard evidence from **Witness A** on behalf of the Council, and on behalf of the Registrant, her own evidence and evidence from four character witnesses, one of whom also gave evidence about procedures at **[redacted]**.

Parties' submissions

On behalf of the Council, Miss Ling submitted that the Committee should find the allegations proved. She reminded the Committee that the burden of proving the allegations is entirely on the Council and that the standard of proof is the civil standard, proof on a balance of probabilities. She conceded that the Registrant is a person of good character and is entitled to have that taken in to account but said this was a 'last resort'. Miss Ling submitted that **[redacted]**, the Council's only witness, did not know the Registrant, had no animus towards her and had come to the hearing to tell the truth. She said that the Registrant was not credible or consistent in her evidence.

On behalf of the Registrant Miss Tighe said that it was **[redacted]**'s policy that persons suspected of stealing from its shops could only be stopped within its premises and that the Registrant had not left the shop. In relation to the cardigan she said that it was not mentioned in **Witness A**' initial report and that her client was confident she was wearing it for work and that it was hers.

Miss Tighe submitted that the Registrant wanted to be properly dressed for work and was under pressure to get to work on time. She said it was apparent that the Registrant had no financial problems. She had retained the ticket for the trousers and offered to pay for them. Miss Tighe reminded the Committee that her client is a person of good character and pointed to the testimonials, written and oral, which were before the Committee. She accepted the test for dishonesty as set out in the Council's skeleton argument and said that her client was not on that basis dishonest.

Findings in relation to the facts

The Committee throughout its deliberations had in mind that the burden of proving the allegations rests upon the Council and that the required standard of proof is the civil standard, proof on a balance of probabilities. It also took account of the Registrant's good character.

It assessed each of the witnesses it had heard from:

Witness A

The Committee found this witness, an **[redacted]** employee for about seven years, to be credible and experienced in dealing with shop theft. She particularly recalled the case despite the large number of cases she dealt with because unusually it involved a locum optometrist and she had made a contemporaneous note of the events she had witnessed. When she did not know the answer to a question she said so.

The Registrant

The Committee took in to account cultural and language issues but also noted that the Registrant has been living and working in the UK for a number of years. It found the Registrant consistent in her version of events but at times her evidence was confusing. She tended to make statements rather than answer questions. Overall it

did not find the Registrant to be a wholly credible witness and where there was conflict it preferred the evidence of **Witness A**.

Witness B

The Registrant and this witness had been in a relationship some years ago. His evidence was primarily that he was a guarantor of a loan which the Registrant had obtained to buy a property in Spain and that she was repaying it promptly. The Committee accepted that evidence.

Witness C

The Committee found this witness helpful. She had a lot of knowledge of [redacted] policy and procedure. It was apparent that she did not have a complete understanding of what was alleged against the Registrant. All of her experience over ten years was in the [redacted] branch, not the [redacted] store.

Witness D

This witness was strong on how much she trusted the Registrant. Her contact with the Registrant was a considerable time ago. However, she and the Registrant had been colleagues and friends and the Committee accepted her evidence.

Witness E

This witness gave evidence about how trustworthy the Registrant was and she had given her access to the cash register at her opticians. The Committee accepted that evidence, but it was of limited value as it was about events some time ago.

The Committee found the following in relation to each particular of allegation:

Particular 1a

Proved

Particular 1a was admitted on a limited basis: that the Registrant had attempted to remove the trousers from the premises. There was no admission that she was obliged to pay for them before removal. This formed the basis of a submission that the Registrant was not obliged to pay for them then because she had not left the premises. The Committee found that the Registrant had passed the last point of payment and was stopped at the barrier at the exit door. **Witness A** said that staff were not allowed to detain customers once they had left the premises for safety reasons. It was apparent from her evidence and that of **Witness C** that the Registrant could have put the goods aside in the [redacted] store but could not remove them until she had paid for them. The Committee was not convinced that the Registrant did not know how to use the self scan checkouts, nor that she could not have paid for the trousers at a serviced checkout. The Committee was satisfied that by the rules applied by [redacted] the Registrant had attempted to remove the trousers from the premises when she should have paid for them.

Particular 1b

Proved

Witness A did not mention the cardigan in the report she completed on the day of these events for her area manager. The Committee accepted her reason was that she only included events she had personally observed, and she had not seen the

cardigan because the Registrant had a coat on. The details of the cardigan were in **Witness A's** witness statement. In giving her evidence she was consistent and adamant that she had seen two tickets when she apprehended the Registrant and was given two items back by her, trousers and a black cardigan, and that the Registrant then offered to pay for two items. The Registrant does not mention a cardigan in her witness statement. The Committee has in mind that the burden is on the Council to prove its case. Either **Witness A** was confused or mistaken if the Registrant's evidence is accepted. It has found **Witness A** to be a reliable witness with no reason to give false evidence against the Registrant.

The Committee found it proved that the Registrant attempted to remove the cardigan from the premises when she should have paid for it.

Particular 2a

Proved

As advised by the Legal Adviser, the Committee gave this word its ordinary meaning. It has found that the Registrant attempted to remove items from the premises which she should have paid for but did not. That was clearly inappropriate.

Particular 2b

Not proved

The Committee was not persuaded that this particular was proved by the Council to the required standard. The goods were of low value (the trousers were priced at £6.00). The value of the cardigan is not known. The Registrant had money in her bank account and a good income. It was not clear what the Registrant's motivation was. She would have benefited financially from removing the property without paying for them but the Committee was not persuaded that she was financially motivated in doing so.

Particular 2c

Proved

The Committee, as advised, applied the test set out by the Supreme Court in Ivey v Genting Casinos [2017] UKSC 67.

It first considered what was the actual, subjective, belief or knowledge of the Registrant at the material time. Her case was that she believed she was able to pay for the trousers at the end of her shift, even though she was wearing them. That could be a genuine belief, even if it was an unreasonable belief. However, the Registrant said she had paid for a blouse she had selected and tried on after selecting the trousers. Her case was that she would have been late for work if she had attempted to explain, whilst paying for the blouse, why she was wearing trousers she had not paid for. The Committee found the Registrant had three opportunities to pay for the trousers: at the clothing till on the first floor, or at the self scan facility and at the serviced tills on the ground floor. She had to pass through the self scan facility on the way to the toilet where the Committee is satisfied, on the evidence of **Witness A**, she changed from her jeans to the black trousers. The Committee does not accept the Registrant's explanation that she was motivated not to pay for the trousers because she would then have been late for work. She had time to pay for the blouse at the till and could have paid for the trousers at the same time. Further,

the Registrant told **Witness A** initially that she had paid for the trousers at the self scan facility. **Witness A** was adamant from what she had seen on the CCTV that this was not the case.

The Registrant told the Committee that she was not confident that she knew how to operate the self scan checkout. The Registrant gave evidence that she believed she could take goods out of the supermarket and in to the optical store and pay for them at the end of the day as she was simply going to another part of [redacted] and that there was an informal procedure which permitted this.

Witness A gave evidence that at the [redacted] branch there was no procedure informal or otherwise that permitted that, that all goods had to be paid for before they were taken from the supermarket and that [redacted] was a separate premises.

The Registrant called **Witness C** who gave evidence about procedures at [redacted]. However, that evidence did not support the Registrant's assertions. **Witness C** said that items had to be paid for immediately if they were being worn and that at her branch the opticians was in the supermarket, and not outside.

The Committee was satisfied to the required standard that at the material time the Registrant knew she was in possession of goods which she was obliged to pay for and that she deliberately did not pay for them. Her version of what she had in her mind is not credible.

The Committee applied those findings when it considered, objectively, whether ordinary, decent members of the public would find what the Committee has concluded was the Registrant's actual state of mind to be dishonest. It was satisfied that ordinary decent members of the public would consider it to be dishonest to attempt to remove goods from a shop without paying for them when there was an obligation to pay for them.

Findings in relation to misconduct and impairment

The Committee has heard submissions on behalf of the Council and the Registrant. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser. The Legal Adviser advised that the relevant tests and authorities were set out in the Council's skeleton argument.

The Committee was informed at the outset of the submissions that the Registrant admitted both misconduct and impairment. However, these remained issues to be decided by the Committee.

Parties' submissions

On behalf of the Council Miss Ling referred to its skeleton argument. She submitted that the Registrant had acted in a dishonest manner by attempting to steal from the store and had breached the Council's Standards of Practise:

16.1 Act with honesty and integrity to maintain public trust and confidence in your profession.

17 Do not damage the reputation of your profession through your conduct

17.1 Ensure your conduct, whether or not connected to your professional practice, does not damage public confidence in you or your profession.

She further submitted that the Registrant abused her position of trust in that she attempted to persuade **Witness A** to take another course of action because of her employment as a locum.

In summary, she submitted that the registrant's actions amounted to misconduct.

Miss Ling referred to the case of *CHRE v Grant* [2011] EWHC 927 which contained the following:

“Do our findings of fact in respect of the doctor’s misconduct, deficient professional performance, adverse health, conviction, caution or determination show that his/her fitness to practise is impaired in the sense that s/he:

- a. *has in the past acted and/or is liable in the future to act so as to put a patient or patients at unwarranted risk of harm; and/or*
- b. *has in the past brought and/or is liable in the future to bring the medical profession into disrepute; and/or*
- c. *has in the past breached and/or is liable in the future to breach one of the fundamental tenets of the medical profession; and/or*
- d. *has in the past acted dishonestly and/or is liable to act dishonestly in the future.”*

Miss Ling submitted that c to d were engaged in this case and in respect of a the Committee could take in to account that all appointments on that day had to be cancelled so that there was an impact on patients.

Miss Ling said there was insufficient insight on behalf of the Registrant and because of that lack of insight and the fact that behavioural issues like dishonesty are hard to remedy there was a real risk of repetition. She submitted that a finding of impaired fitness to practise was necessary to protect the wider public interest.

On behalf of the Registrant, Miss Tighe submitted that this was an isolated incident. And hadn't been repeated. She further submitted that cancelling the appointments did not place patients at risk of harm. Miss Tighe submitted there was no abuse of trust in the circumstances of this case and no risk of repetition as the events which had taken place were unique in nature, very specific and a reaction highly unlikely to be repeated in the future.

The Committee considered first whether there was misconduct in this case which is serious. It was satisfied that what took place was not trivial and that it passed the

threshold for a finding of serious misconduct. It considered the relevant parts of Standards of Practice to which it had been referred by the Council and held they had been breached. It had found as a fact that the Registrant had three opportunities to pay for the trousers and cardigan but had not done so. In addition, the Registrant when initially confronted claimed to have paid for the trousers and later offered to pay for them.

The Committee was satisfied that the facts found proved amount to serious misconduct.

Having found serious misconduct, the Committee went on to consider whether as a result the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired. It found the Registrant had not shown insight in to what had occurred. She had tried to convince **Witness A** that she had paid for the items and then offered to pay for them to bring the matter to a close. There was no motivation that the Committee could discern for the Registrant's actions. This meant that the Committee could not be sure there would be no repetition. However, the Committee gives the Registrant some credit for the admissions of misconduct and impairment made following the findings of fact, which shows a degree of insight. It does not accept the submissions made by the Council that the cancelling of appointments placed patients at risk or that there was an abuse of her position by the Registrant.

This was an isolated incident in an otherwise unblemished career. The Committee did not accept Miss Tighe's submission that this was a very special set of circumstances which could be described as unique. Because of the almost total lack of insight the committee could not be sure there would be no repetition and the lack of insight makes it impossible to find that the Registrant has remedied her failings.

The Committee took in to account the testimonials received on the Registrant's behalf, which were impressive though largely historic but given by people who know the Registrant well.

The Committee considered whether a finding of impairment was necessary to uphold public confidence in the profession. These were serious acts of dishonesty by a professional person. The public expects high standards of conduct from professionals. It had no doubt that public confidence in the Registrant's profession would be damaged if no finding of impairment was made.

Accordingly, the Committee finds that the Registrant's fitness to practise is currently impaired.

Sanction

The Committee has heard submissions from Miss Ling on behalf of the Council and from Miss Tighe on behalf of the Registrant. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser.

Miss Ling drew the Committee's attention to the Council's skeleton argument. She submitted that sanctions are not intended to be punitive and are intended to protect the public interest in the wider sense. She further submitted that any sanction should be proportionate, balancing the public interest against the interests of the Registrant. Miss Ling submitted that there were mitigating factors, in that this was an isolated incident in an otherwise unblemished career. She said there was no previous history of misconduct and that the goods involved were of low value. Miss

Ling said there were also aggravating factors, in particular, dishonesty and a lack of insight and the possibility of repetition. Her final submission was that a period of suspension under twelve months would be appropriate and proportionate.

Miss Tighe began her submission by informing the Committee that the Registrant was sorry for her misconduct and wished to apologise. She submitted that the Registrant has participated fully in the fitness to practise process. Miss Tighe also told the Committee that her client was realistic and accepted that suspension was the appropriate sanction, although it was a matter for the Committee's judgment. She submitted that a period of suspension would allow the Registrant to gain greater insight and to develop strategies to deal with similar situations if they arise. She submitted that an appropriate period of suspension would be one to three months.

Miss Tighe referred the Committee to the Indicative Sanctions Guidance (ISG) at paragraph 39.1 which indicates that erasure is not inevitable in cases involving dishonesty. She said that erasure would be disproportionate and that it was not the only way of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

Miss Tighe said in mitigation that this was an isolated event, there was no fitness to practise history, there was no risk of harm to patients and no abuse of trust. She referred the Committee to the ISG paragraph 34.1 which sets out the criteria for suspension and said that there was no evidence of repetition and that the Registrant had insight, although limited.

The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that the purpose of sanctions is not to be punitive but were intended to protect the public interest. He advised that any sanction imposed should be proportionate and referred the Committee to relevant passages of the ISG.

The Committee began by considering the mitigating factors in this case. This was an isolated incident over a long career. There is no previous adverse history against the Registrant and the goods involved were of low value. It considered the testimonials provided to the Committee. From these it is clear that the Registrant is clinically sound, based on five professional testimonials, two of which are historical. The personal testimonials, the Committee found of limited value as they were based on a version of events given by the Registrant to their authors. There was no risk of harm to patients as a result of the Registrant's actions, this was a one off event and it did not involve a sophisticated act of dishonesty. The Committee gave appropriate weight to the Registrant's engagement in the process, her admissions over misconduct and impairment and to her recent apologies.

The Committee also considered what aggravating features there were. This was a case of dishonesty in which the Registrant had only shown limited insight. The Committee cannot assess the risk of repetition because the Registrant's motivation for her actions is unclear and has not been explained.

The Committee then considered the sanctions open to it in ascending order of seriousness, as advised by the Legal Adviser.

The Committee first considered whether it was appropriate to take no further action. This would be an exceptional course and would not meet the seriousness of the misconduct. It then considered whether a financial penalty was appropriate. It found

it was not. There was no evidence that the Registrant was financially motivated by her actions.

In considering whether the imposition of conditions was appropriate the Committee considered the relevant guidance in the ISG at paragraph 33.9. None of the following criteria, except for (a), applied in this case:

33.9

- a. No evidence of harmful deep seated personality or attitudinal problems;
- b. Identifiable areas of registrant's practice in need of assessment or retraining;
- c. Evidence that registrant has insight into any health problems and is prepared to agree to abide by conditions on medical condition, treatment and supervision;
- d. Potential and willingness to respond positively to retraining;
- e. Patients will not be put in danger either directly or indirectly as a result of conditional registration itself;
- f. The conditions will protect patients during the period they are in force; or
- g. It is possible to formulate appropriate and practical conditions to impose on registration and make provision as to how conditions will be monitored.

The Committee concluded that it could not formulate conditions which were appropriate given its finding of dishonesty and that conditions would not meet the seriousness of the case and the public interest.

The Committee then considered whether a period of suspension was appropriate and proportionate. It considered the guidance given in the ISG at paragraph 34.1.

34.1

- a. A serious instance of misconduct but where a lesser sanction is not sufficient;
- b. No evidence of harmful deep-seated personality or attitudinal problems;

- c. No evidence of repetition of behaviour since incident;
- d. The panel is satisfied the registrant has insight and does not pose a significant risk of repeating behaviour;
- e. In cases where the only issue relates to the registrant's health, there is a risk to patient safety if the registrant was allowed to continue to practise even under conditions; or

It concluded that factors (a), (b) and (c) apply in this case. It is unable to gauge the risk of repetition and has found that the Registrant's insight is limited. The Committee has no evidence of what effect suspension would have on the Registrant but infers it would have some financial or other effect. Taking all of the relevant factors in to account, the Committee considers that a period of suspension is appropriate and proportionate to mark the seriousness of the conduct in this case and to protect the public interest in maintenance of public confidence in the profession. It considers that a period of six months suspension is appropriate and proportionate and will give the Registrant time to develop insight, reflect upon her actions and to develop strategies to avoid repetition of her misconduct.

The Committee did, as advised by the ISG, consider the next potential sanction, erasure, before deciding upon suspension.

The ISG gives the following criteria for erasure at paragraph 36.5.

36.5

- a. Serious departure from the relevant professional standards as set out in the Standards of Practice for registrants and the Code of Conduct for business registrants;
- b. Doing serious harm to individuals (patients or otherwise), either deliberately or through incompetence, and particularly where there is a continuing risk to patients;
- c. Abuse of position/trust (particularly involving vulnerable patients) or violation of the rights of patients;
- d. Offences of a sexual nature, including involvement in child pornography;
- e. Offences involving violence;
- f. Dishonesty (especially where persistent and covered up); or

FURTHER INFORMATION
<p>Transcript</p>
<p>A full transcript of the hearing will be made available for purchase in due course.</p>
<p>Appeal</p>
<p>Any appeal against an order of the Committee must be lodged with the relevant court within 28 days of the service of this notification. If no appeal is lodged, the order will take effect at the end of that period. The relevant court is shown at section 23G(4)(a)-(c) of the Opticians Act 1989 (as amended).</p>
<p>Professional Standards Authority</p>
<p>This decision will be reported to the Professional Standards Authority (PSA) under the provisions of section 29 of the NHS Reform and Healthcare Professions Act 2002. PSA may refer this case to the High Court of Justice in England and Wales, the Court of Session in Scotland or the High Court of Justice in Northern Ireland as appropriate if they decide that a decision has been insufficient to protect the public and/or should not have been made, and if they consider that referral is desirable for the protection of the public. PSA is required to make its decision within 40 days of the hearing (or 40 days from the last day on which a Registrant can appeal against the decision, if applicable) and will send written confirmation of a decision to refer to Registrants on the first working day following a hearing. PSA will notify you promptly of a decision to refer. A letter will be sent by recorded delivery to your registered address (unless PSA has been notified by the GOC of a change of address).</p> <p>Further information about the PSA can be obtained from its website at www.professionalstandards.org.uk or by telephone on 020 7389 8030.</p>
<p>Effect of orders for suspension or erasure</p>
<p>To practise or carry on business as an optometrist or dispensing optician, to take or use a description which implies registration or entitlement to undertake any activity which the law restricts to a registered person, may amount to a criminal offence once an entry in the register has been suspended or erased.</p>
<p>European Alert</p>

The General Optical Council is required by Regulation 67 of the European Union (Recognition of Professional Qualifications) Regulations 2015 to inform all European competent authorities of any restrictions or prohibitions on a dispensing optician or an optometrist's practice. 'Competent authority' effectively means the relevant regulator for each EU member state.

The GOC is the competent authority for all opticians registered in the United Kingdom (UK).

If you have been made subject to either a suspension or conditions of practice order (whether interim or substantive), or to an erasure order, we hereby notify you of the following:

- Within 3 days of the Fitness to Practise Committee decision taking effect you will be the subject of an alert sent under article 56a(1) of the Directive;
- You have the right to appeal the decision to issue the alert or to apply for rectification of the decision; and
- You have the right to access remedies in respect of any damage caused by false alerts sent to other competent authorities.

The alert is sent securely via the Internal Market Information (IMI) system. The alert will include the following details:

- Your identity (full name and date of birth);
- Your profession;
- Your GOC registration number;
- The fact that the GOC is the national authority which adopted the decision on the restriction or prohibition of your professional activities;
- The scope of the restriction or prohibition;
- The period during which the restriction or the prohibition applies.

If you wish to appeal the decision to issue this alert then please see the information sheet below. Please note that this relates to your right of appeal against the issuing of the alert – see above regarding your right of appeal against a substantive decision.

A copy of the alert may be obtained via the contact details at the end of this document.

Please see the attached information sheet for further information

Contact

If you require any further information, please contact the Council's Hearings Manager at 10 Old Bailey, London, EC4M 7NG or, by telephone, on 020 7580 3898.