

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

**GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL**

**F(25)37**

**AND**

**ANEEKA RAMZAN (01-33690)**

---

**NOTICE OF INQUIRY  
SUBSTANTIVE HEARING**

---

Take Notice that an Inquiry will be conducted in the above matter by the Fitness to Practise Committee of the General Optical Council.

A substantive hearing will be proceeding:

**Remotely**

The substantive hearing will take commence at 9:30am on **Thursday 14 May to Thursday 21 May 2026** by way of video conference or telephone conference facilities.

The Inquiry will be based upon the allegation submitted by the Council (see below) and will determine whether the fitness to practise of **Aneeka Ramzan** is impaired by virtue of the provisions contained in section 13D(2) of the Opticians Act 1989.

---

Euan Napier  
Hearings Manager, General Optical Council

**20 March 2026**

## ALLEGATION

The Council alleges that you, Aneeka Ramzan (01-33690), a registered Optometrist, whilst working at Specsavers Opticians, [redacted], on or around 28 May 2024, you conducted a sight test on Patient A and:

1. Failed to maintain adequate patient records in that there was a failure to document the details of the member of support staff who carried out the preliminary examinations on Patient A in his clinical record, including name and signature or other identification of the author.
2. Failed to advise Patient A that the new spectacles' prescription you had issued him with may have been inaccurate due to his current pathology and may need to be changed at a later date or, if this advice was in fact given, you failed to record this in the patient record.
3. Failed to send an urgent referral to the Hospital Eye Service for further investigation of Patient A's suspected BRVO (branch retinal vein occlusion) in his right eye.
4. Failed to maintain adequate patient records in that you falsified an entry in Patient A's records to indicate that the hospital had communicated to you that they had received the referral, when they had not, in fact, done so.
5. Your conduct as set out above at 4 is:
  - a. Dishonest in that you knew the hospital had not confirmed receipt of the referral; and/or
  - b. Misleading.

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

---

**Committee Members:** Adrian Smith (Chair/Lay)  
Ben Summerskill (Lay)  
Kevin Connolly (Lay)  
Danielle Ellis (Optometrist)  
Kalpana Theophilus (Optometrist)

**Legal Adviser:** Aaminah Khan

**Hearings Officer:** Arjeta Shabani

**Transcribers:** Marten Walsh Cherer Limited

If you require further information relating to this hearing, please contact the Council's Hearings Manager at [hearings@optical.org](mailto:hearings@optical.org).