

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

**GENERAL OPTICAL**

**COUNCIL AND**

**GARETH LONG (01-24213)**

---

**NOTICE OF INQUIRY  
RESUMPTION OF SUBSTANTIVE HEARING**

---

Take notice that an inquiry will be continued in the above matter by the Fitness to Practise Committee of the General Optical Council.

The substantive hearing will resume on the following dates, by way of video conference or telephone conference facilities at **9:30am from Wednesday 21 February 2024 to Friday 23 February 2024 and on Friday 5 July 2024.**

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

.

---

Euan Napier  
Hearings Manager, General Optical Council

9 January 2024

### **ALLEGATION (as amended)**

The Council alleges that you, Gareth Long (01-24213), a registered optometrist, whilst employed at Spa Medica [redacted]:

- 1) On or around 14 December 2021 you:
  - a. Did not verify Patient A's identity prior to the consultation taking place;
  - b. Advised Patient A that he had cystoid macular oedema when he did not have cystoid macula oedema.
- 2) On 14 December 2021 on or around 9.36 pm you inserted additional notes onto Patient A's record for 14 December 2021 including:
  - a. In relation to 2 a, you discussed cystoid macular oedema with Patient A and not the YAG capsulotomy
  - b. In relation to 2 b you had written the note for Patient A;
  - c. In relation to 2 c it was Patient A and not Patient X who had asked you to write the note;
  - d. In relation to 2 d Patient A and Patient X had not been sat next to each other in the waiting area;
  - e. In relation to 2 e you had provided the note to Patient A;
  - f. In relation to 2 f Patient A was not confused about the reason for his visit in that he understood his visit was for a YAG capsulotomy.
- 3) The records referred to at 2 a – f above were inaccurate in that:
  - a. In relation to 2 a, you discussed cystoid macular oedema with Patient A and not the YAG capsulotomy
  - b. In relation to 2 b you had written the note for Patient A;
  - c. In relation to 2 c it was Patient A and not Patient X who had asked you to write the note;
  - d. In relation to 2 d Patient A and Patient X had not been sat next to each other in the waiting area;
  - e. In relation to 2 e you had provided the note to Patient A;
  - f. In relation to 2 f Patient A was not confused about the reason for his visit in that he understood his visit was for a YAG capsulotomy.
- 4) You recorded that it would be wise for Patient A to be accompanied by a chaperone and to use a dual consent form for any further Tx required when a chaperone and/or a dual consent form was not indicated.
- 5) Your conduct at 2 a – f and/or 3 a - f was dishonest in that:
  - a. You knew the record was inaccurate; and/or

- b. you made the additional record in order to conceal that you had incorrectly advised Patient A that he had cystoid macula oedema.

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

**Committee Members:** Rachel O'Connell (Chair)  
Mark McLaren (Lay)  
Asmita Naik (Lay)  
Denise Connor (Optometrist)  
Gaynor Kirk (Optometrist)

**Legal Adviser:** TBC

**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](mailto:hearings@optical.org).