

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

GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL

F(21)13

AND

ZAHIR IBRAHIM - (D-14908)

**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 resuming substantive hearing will be proceeding:

Remotely

The resuming substantive hearing will take commence at 9:30am on the dates below, by way of video conference or telephone conference facilities.

Monday 13 - Friday 17 June 2022

Monday 8 – Friday 12 August 2022

Monday 22 – Friday 26 August 2022

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

Vineeta Desai
Hearings Manager, General Optical Council

11 March 2022

ALLEGATION

The Council alleges that you, Mr Zahir Ibrahim (D-14908), a registered dispensing optician:

1. *Posted written posts and/or videos to [redacted]:*
 - a. *On 5 May 2017 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses alone could straighten Patient P's eyes;*
 - b. *On 7 May 2017 which stated that colour tinted spectacles can be used to try "to reduce the disabling effects of disorder found not only in Learning difficulties (reading and writing) but also those found in AUTISTIC SPECTRUM DISORDERS";*
 - c. *On 10 May 2017 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses disabled the effects of hypermobility for Patient A;*
 - d. *On 15 July 2017 which stated that "COLOUR SPECTACLE" can be used "to disable the effects of the disorders";*
 - e. *On and 1 or around 2 August 2017 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses:*
 - i. *Reduced the impact of multiple sclerosis on Patient D's mobility;*
 - ii. *Enabled Patient D to walk without support from a functional electrical stimulation machine;*
 - iii. *Enabled Patient D to walk more quickly;*
 - iv. *Improved the posture of Patient D;*
 - v. *Enabled Patient D to walk in a straighter line;*

- f. On 14 August 2017 and I or on one or more unknown dates which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses alone had an impact on Patient H's ability to read;*
 - g. On 20 October 2017 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses enabled Patient J to walk without assistance;*
 - h. On 20 October 2017 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses can have an impact on the symptoms or effects of learning difficulties and/or autistic spectrum disorders, and/or mental health issues;*
 - i. On 21 February 2018 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses disabled the effects of vertigo for Patient K;*
 - j. On 21 February 2018 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses could be used to manage and/or treat and/or improve learning difficulties and vertigo or their symptoms;*
 - k. On an unknown date which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses can have an impact on bladder control for Patient L;*
-
2. *One or more of the impressions given at 1 were inappropriate and/or misleading in that they were not supported by objective evidence or were supported by controversial evidence;*
-
3. *Failed to explain in the [redacted] posts and/or videos that one or more of the impressions given at 1 were not supported by objective evidence or were supported by controversial evidence;*
-
4. *The impression given at 1.f was inappropriate and/or misleading and/or inaccurate in that you did not explain that the refractive correction in Patient H's glasses had an impact on his ability to read;*
-
5. *Your conduct at 1.f was dishonest in that you knew that the refractive*

correction in Patient H's glasses had an impact on his ability to read and intended to conceal this from Patient H and/or Patient H's carer and/or the viewers of the [redacted] posts and videos;

6. *Posted written posts and/or videos to [redacted]:*
 - a. *On 5 May 2017 which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses reduced body movements for Patient P;*
 - b. *On 17 July 2017 and I or on one or more unknown dates, which gave the impression that colour tinted lenses prevented or reduced twitching in Patient B's hands and I or feet;*
7. *The impressions given at 6.a and/or 6.b were inappropriate and/or misleading in that you did not explain why colour tinted had or might have had an impact on the patient's behaviour;*
8. *On 11 August 2017 and I or an unknown date posted a written post and/or video to [redacted] in relation Patient E;*
9. *Your conduct at 8 was inappropriate and/or misleading in that you failed to explain that the evidence supporting the use of colour tinted lenses was controversial;*
10. *On 12 August 2017 posted a video to [redacted] in which you stated "the colour glasses has in, in essence, caused the medication dosage to come down a bit";*
11. *Your conduct at 10 was:*
 - a. *Outside the scope of your practice;*
 - b. *Inappropriate and/or misleading in that you failed to explain that the evidence to support this statement was controversial;*
12. *On 21 February 2018 posted to [redacted] a post which stated that a patient "had nothing to lose" by trying colour tinted lenses;*

13. Your conduct at 12 was inappropriate and/or misleading in that you failed to explain that interventions carry a cost in terms of expense, and/or time, and/or raised expectations;

AND by virtue of the facts set out above, your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of Misconduct

Committee Members: Ms Valerie Paterson (Lay)
Mr Ben Summerskill(Lay)
Mr Nigel Pilkington (Lay)
Ms Sarah Baylay (Dispensing Optician)

Legal Adviser: Mr Graeme Henderson

Hearings Officer: TBC

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.