

**BEFORE THE REGISTRATION APPEALS COMMITTEE  
OF THE GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL**

**R(24)01**

**VISHNU PARASRAM**

**AND**

**THE GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL**

---

**DETERMINATION OF THE REGISTRATION APPEALS COMMITTEE  
18-19 MARCH 2025**

---

<b>Committee Members:</b>	Mr Gaon Hart (Chair/Lay) Mr Mark Richards (Lay) Mr Mark McLaren (Lay) Mr Philip Cross (Dispensing Optician) Miss Sarah Castree (Dispensing Optician)
<b>Legal adviser:</b>	Ms Sadia Zouq
<b>GOC Presenting Officer:</b>	Mr Bradley Albuery
<b>Applicant present/represented:</b>	Yes, and not represented
<b>Hearings Officer:</b>	Ms Natasha Bance
<b>Outcome:</b>	Application for Restoration Refused

---

On 18 to 19 March 2025, the Registration Appeals Committee of the General Optical Council met to consider an application by Mr Vishnu Parasram ('the Applicant') for restoration to the register of Dispensing Opticians.

## **Preliminary Matters**

### Bias and recusal

1. At the outset of the hearing, Committee Member Miss Castree informed the Committee, and subsequently the Legal Adviser informed the Applicant and Mr Albuery, that in her role as lecturer at the City and Islington College she had taught the [redacted] in the early 2010's.
2. The Legal Adviser reminded the Committee that the Applicant is entitled to a fair hearing, which includes the right to adjudication by an independent and impartial Committee. The question to be asked is "*would the fair-minded and informed observer, having considered the facts, conclude that there was a real possibility that the tribunal was biased?*" (*Porter v Magill* [2002] 2 AC 357). Whether a Committee member should recuse themselves is a decision to be taken by the Committee as a whole and not the individual Committee member.
3. The Applicant and Mr Albuery were content for Miss Castree to hear the restoration application. The Committee determined that a fair-minded observer, having considered the relevant facts, would not conclude that there was a real possibility of bias. Accordingly, Miss Castree did not recuse herself from the Committee.

### Privacy

4. The Legal Adviser referred the Committee to the Applicant's statement in which he makes reference to his private life and [redacted]. She advised the Committee in relation to Rule 17 of the Registration Appeals Rules 2005 ('the Rules').
5. The Committee determined that, in the interests of justice, where reference is made to the Applicant's private life and [redacted], the hearing should be conducted in private to protect the Applicant's right to privacy. The Committee felt that this derogation from the principles of open justice was satisfied and were necessary and proportionate. It directed that those parts of the hearing would be conducted in private.

## Background

6. The Applicant was first registered as a student Dispensing Optician on 23 November 2005 and was transferred to the fully qualified register on 13 April 2006.

## Fitness to Practise hearing 2015

7. On 20 January 2015, a Fitness to Practise Committee ('FTPC') considered the following allegation:

1. *Between 1 November 2012 and 23 April 2013, you misappropriated £8,110.45 from your employer Specsavers Opticians in [redacted];*
2. *Your actions in (1) above were dishonest;*

*AND, by virtue of the matters set out above your fitness to practise is impaired by reason of your misconduct.*

8. The Applicant was previously employed at the Specsavers Opticians store in [redacted] as the branch manager. Amongst other duties, his role involved cashing up and banking the store's takings. Between 1 November 2012 and 23 April 2013, the Applicant on occasions was solely responsible for banking. On numerous occasions he failed to bank monies received by the store, resulting in a deficit of £8,110.45. The Applicant's employer noticed irregular banking patterns for the store and began an investigation which included the use of covert CCTV. The Applicant was subsequently interviewed in relation to the missing monies. He initially denied theft of the monies but then made full and frank admissions to the allegation. After the interview the Applicant took his employer home and returned £4,428.35. On 4 June 2013, the Applicant paid all the remaining monies to his employer. The Applicant self reported this matter to the Council on 20 May 2013.
9. The Applicant admitted all particulars of the allegation and the FTPC found the allegation proved. The FTPC found misconduct. When considering misconduct, the FTPC determined as follows:

*"The Registrant, as an employee was in a position of responsibility and trust. This responsibility extended to honestly banking the monies from the store. In admitting the allegation, the Registrant breached this trust. The Registrant acted dishonestly over a period of 5 months which involved several and separate amounts received and banking transactions. This was not a one-off matter of dishonesty. The total amount involved is £8110.45, which is a*

*significant amount. The Registrant only ceased this course of dishonesty when confronted by a loss-prevention officer of Specsavers Opticians.”*

10. The FTPC found the Registrant impaired. When considering impairment, the FTPC determined as follows:

*“The Committee was mindful of its findings of dishonesty and misconduct. It was of the view that dishonesty is difficult to remedy given the dishonesty element involved therein. It considered that integrity and honesty are the bedrock of the profession. The public must be assured that these principles are, and will be, maintained because trust in the profession depends upon practitioners conducting themselves with integrity at all times. The Committee accept that the Registrant repaid to his employer all monies that he dishonestly appropriated. However, that is not a complete remedy and the Registrant showed limited signs of remediation. In particular, the Registrant showed limited signs of remediation in his attitude towards his actions.*

*The Committee has received no evidence including any professional references or testimonials, to reassure it that the Registrant will not repeat similar conduct in future. The Committee was of the view that a finding of no impairment would undermine the need to uphold proper professional standards and public confidence in the profession and in its regulator. Accordingly, the Committee found that the fitness of Vishnu Parasram to practise as a dispensing optician is impaired.”*

11. With regard to sanction, the FTPC took into account the aggravating and mitigating features of the case and had particular regard to the requirement that Registrants must be ‘honest and trustworthy’. The FTPC determined as follows:

*The Registrant was a manager in the store and as a managerial employee was in a position of responsibility and trust. The Registrant acted dishonestly over a period of 5 months. This was a sustained course of dishonesty. The total amount involved is £8110.45, which is a significant amount. The Registrant only ceased this course of dishonesty when confronted by a loss-prevention officer on behalf of Specsavers. After the Registrant was interviewed under caution, £4463.25 was recovered from his home. This sum of money had been in his possession between the 23 April and 20 May 2013. This is a significant period of time and must be considered in the light of the Registrant’s evidence that his original indebtedness was approximately £3000.*

*The Committee applied the principle of proportionality of the Registrant’s interest with the public interest. It considered that the Registrant abused his position of trust and had acted dishonestly. There was limited evidence that he had taken sufficient steps to remedy his conduct. The Committee has already found that there remains a risk of the registrant repeating his misconduct.*

*Given the seriousness of the misconduct, the Committee form the view that the Registrant's conduct and dishonesty are fundamentally incompatible with him continuing as a registered professional.*

*The Committee has concluded that the appropriate and proportionate sanction in this case is erasure. This is because of the seriousness of the matters found proved. The need to protect the public and to uphold public confidence in the profession cannot be achieved if the Registrant remains on the register. The Committee was satisfied that these considerations outweighed any consequential financial hardship or any other impact that an erasure order may have on the Registrant.*

12. The Applicant was removed from the register by the Registrations team on 12 January 2016.

### **First application for restoration**

13. The Applicant first applied to be restored to the register on 25 November 2017. The hearing of his application did not take place until 25 June 2019 following three requests by the Applicant for the hearing to be re-listed in April 2018 and April 2019. The Applicant also requested that the fourth scheduled hearing on 25 June 2019 be postponed, but the Committee refused to adjourn and the application for restoration went ahead in his absence. The Committee refused to restore the Applicant to the register.

14. The Committee noted the seriousness of the matters which resulted in the Applicant's erasure:

*The Committee was of the view that the misconduct for which the Applicant had been erased from the register had been serious, in that there had been repeated instances of dishonesty committed in breach of a position of trust. In such circumstances, the Committee was of the view that the assessment of the Applicant's integrity and honesty was particularly important.*

15. The Committee also noted the Applicant's conduct since his erasure. In particular, the Committee was concerned about the circumstances in which the Applicant's GOS contract with NHS England was terminated in January 2017 as a result of inaccurate information provided by him, and his improper use of the protected title 'optician' in his description of himself at Companies House. The Committee could not be reassured as to the Applicant's integrity and honesty.

16. The Committee was also mindful that the Applicant had not meaningfully engaged with the Council in respect of his application for restoration and his current CET statement demonstrated that he had not completed any CET points in the last 12 months. In all the circumstances, the Committee determined that the Applicant had not provided sufficient evidence to satisfy it that he was fit to practise. The Committee determined that the Applicant should not be restored to the register of Dispensing Opticians.

### **APPLICATION FOR RESTORATION DETERMINATION**

17. The Applicant submitted a second application for restoration on 3 December 2024.

18. The Applicant gave oral evidence at the restoration hearing. Neither the Applicant nor the Council called any other witnesses to give oral evidence. The Committee was provided with the following documents:

- On behalf of the Council, a skeleton argument dated 19 February 2025 and a 166-page bundle which included the following: substantive hearing bundle, substantive hearing decision and transcript, Applicant's first application for restoration to the register, documents regarding activity since erasure, NHS England letters to the Applicant, determination of the first restoration hearing, the Applicant's second application for restoration dated 3 December 2024 and an employment reference from the OutsideClinic addressed to the Council dated 13 December 2024 confirming the Applicant has been employed as a Dispenser since 1 June 2021 and outlining his responsibilities.
- On behalf of the Applicant, a 4-page typed statement from the Applicant dated 12 March 2025, a 2-page typed statement from the Applicant titled "my statement for NHSE" dated 13 March 2025, a photograph showing the Applicant's work badges at Visioncall and OutsideClinic, and seven character references from: Colleague A ([redacted] at OutsideClinic) undated, Colleague B ([redacted] at OutsideClinic) dated 27 February 2025, Colleague C ([redacted] at OutsideClinic) undated, Colleague D (Optometrist) undated, Colleague E ([redacted] at OutsideClinic) undated, Colleague F (Optometrist) dated 24 February 2025, Colleague G ([redacted] at OutsideClinic) undated.

19. Mr Albuery on behalf of the Council set out the Council's opening statement. Mr Albuery noted the salient points within the Council's skeleton argument and submitted that, when considering the specific circumstances of the case, the Applicant is not fit to return to the register.

20. In particular, Mr Albuery highlighted the seriousness of the allegation for which the Applicant was erased. He submitted that the Applicant had taken a large sum of money from his employer over a period of time and breached the trust placed in him.
21. Mr Albuery submitted that the Committee was entitled to consider the events since the Applicant was erased. He told the Committee that in 2017 NHS England terminated the Applicant's GOS contract (through [redacted]) due to concerns about the accuracy of information which the Applicant had provided to them. He referred the Committee to the Applicant's letter dated 16 January 2017 in response to NHS England's concerns and submitted that the Applicant did not appear to be accepting of the allegations he had admitted before the FTPC at the substantive hearing. Mr Albuery submitted that what the Applicant has said today in his evidence about his letter is not credible and is difficult to sustain when considering the evidence in the bundle. He submitted that the Applicant did not respond to NHS England in a way that would satisfy a Committee as to his honesty and integrity.
22. Mr Albuery referred to the Applicant's use of the protected title 'Optician' on Companies House when he was appointed as a director in 2017. He said that the Council wrote to the Applicant on 15 August 2017 requesting that he cease using the description 'Optician' because it was a protected title which he could not use following his erasure. In the absence of a response and removal of the word 'Optician', the Council liaised with Companies House to try to have the description removed. Mr Albuery submitted that either the Applicant described himself as an 'Optician' or he allowed others to do so.
23. For all the above reasons, Mr Albuery invited the Committee to conclude that it could not be satisfied that the Applicant was a fit person to be on the register and the application for restoration should be refused.
24. The Applicant gave evidence. He answered questions in cross examination and from the Committee. In summary, the Applicant said the following in his evidence:
- Correspondence sent to him by post in 2017 was not received as both his home and business [redacted] by March 2017 after which he was residing at a Travelodge hotel.
  - When he made his first application for restoration to the register, he thought he could make things work but soon realised it was not feasible due to his [redacted].

- In 2019 he secured full-time employment with Visioncall, a domiciliary company. Visioncall was subsequently sold to a group who also bought the OutsideClinic, and he was kept on. He was then able to [redacted] which is now his home.
- He will not repeat his misconduct. He expressed regret at having hurt his [redacted]. He had lost his good reputation and self respect.
- In relation to the letter of 16 January 2017, he did not lie to NHS England. He confirmed on oath that he was facing [redacted] and had tried to get help. [redacted], a director at the Specsavers where he worked, suggested that he borrow money from Specsavers as a loan and pay it back. He did not tell the FTPC of this informal arrangement at his substantive hearing in January 2015 because he knew what he had done was wrong and he wanted to move on. Further, [redacted] had made it clear to him that the loan arrangement was confidential. He accepted under oath that what he had said in the initial interview with Specsavers and what he had told the FTPC was not the entire truth.
- He did not mislead the FTPC in January 2015 by not disclosing the loan arrangement with [redacted]. He was sorry for this. He stated “I would get [redacted] into trouble and he made it clear that it was just between him and me. I wasn’t prepared to go into a room and drag someone else into it...I tried to protect [redacted] as he was doing me the favour.”
- He also did not tell Specsavers of the loan arrangement because Specsavers are a big organisation with financial backing, and it was easier for him to admit that he was dishonest so that he could move on.
- When asked why he had described himself as an ‘Optician’ on his corporate registration at Companies House, he replied that he did not make the application to Companies House and does not recall the events of 2017 as he was battling many things in his life. He indicated that ‘[redacted]’ was a name that he had thought of and registered in 2014. At that time, when it was set up in 2014, he was a registered Dispensing Optician and it did not occur to him to change his occupation on Companies House in 2017.
- He does not recall receiving the letter from the Council dated 15 August 2017 asking him to cease use of the protected title of ‘Optician’. After [redacted] by March 2017, there was no forwarding address for his post and he did not receive any forwarded correspondence. He was receiving emails.
- He accepted breaching standards of conduct and behaviour in the past.



- During his period of non-registration with the Council, he did not say or imply to anyone that he was registered with the Council as a Dispensing Optician or Optometrist.
  - To prevent repetition of his misconduct, he ensures there is [redacted]. When asked what he would do if he could not pay a bill, the Applicant replied that he would contact the company requesting payment and explain his position and pay the bill as soon as he could.
  - The seven character references are from colleagues within the profession who are aware that he was not on the register.
  - He is motivated to return to the register as he is now in a better place in his life.
25. In closing submissions, the Applicant told the Committee that he cannot change the past, however, he is confident and happier than before and feels that he has been given a second chance in life. The Applicant said that he is a hard working, straightforward and honest person, and is not a risk to the public. The Applicant said that he had let people down in the past, including friends, colleagues in the profession and his regulator. He sincerely apologised to everyone.

#### The Committee's Approach

26. The Committee reminded itself that the onus is on the Applicant to satisfy the Committee that he is fit to be re-admitted to the Register. The Committee appreciated that it should not seek to go behind the findings of the FTPC's decision from 2015.
27. The Committee accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser that the test to be applied when considering if an applicant should be restored is that set out in *GMC v Chandra [2018] EWCA Civ 1898*: Having considered the circumstances which led to erasure and the extent of remediation and insight, is the applicant now fit to practise having regard to each of the three elements of the overarching objective, namely protecting, promoting and maintaining the health, safety and well-being of the public, promoting and maintaining public confidence in the profession and promoting and maintain professional standards and conduct.
28. The Committee has taken account of all the evidence, submissions, relevant law, and guidance. Factors to be considered by the Committee include:
- The circumstances which led to erasure;

- Any relevant matters post-dating these circumstances;
- The extent to which the applicant has shown remorse and insight;
- The extent to which the applicant has remediated;
- What the applicant has done since his name was erased;
- Steps taken to keep clinical knowledge and skills up to date;
- The length of time elapsed since erasure;
- Any risk posed by the applicant;
- Whether public confidence and professional standards would be damaged by restoring the applicant to the Register.

29. The Committee took account of all the evidence before it, both oral and documentary. It has also considered the submissions made by both parties.

#### The Committee's Decision

30. As outlined above, the FTPC on 20 January 2015 had determined that the Applicant's fitness to practise was impaired by reason of his misconduct. The current Committee noted the nature and level of seriousness of the Applicant's misconduct. The Applicant, as an employee and manager, was in a position of responsibility and trust. This responsibility extended to banking monies from his employer. The Applicant had breached the trust placed in him and had acted dishonestly over a period of 5 months. The Committee noted that the dishonesty involved several and separate amounts of money received and banking transactions. This was not a one-off matter of dishonesty. The total amount taken was £8,110.45, which was significant and was in excess of the Applicant's original indebtedness of approximately £3,000. The Applicant's dishonest conduct only ceased when he was confronted by the loss-prevention officer of Specsavers.

31. The Committee considered that honesty and integrity are fundamental tenets of the profession and that the Applicant's conduct had breached these tenets. The Committee considered that the actions of the Applicant were financially motivated, and in acting in the manner he did he abused his position of trust. The Committee had regard to the FTPC's findings at the sanction stage, in which it was stated that erasure was the only appropriate and proportionate sanction in the circumstances.

### Insight and Remorse

32. The Committee considered the level and scope of the Applicant's insight and remorse. The Committee accepted that the Applicant had expressed considerable shame and remorse. They felt that he genuinely recognised the impact his behaviour had on others, including his [redacted], the profession and his regulator.
33. The Committee specifically noted the character references and, that since 2019, the Applicant had been in full employment as a Dispenser and had the full confidence of both colleagues and managers. The Committee acknowledged that outside of the theft in 2012/2013, the Applicant had no fitness to practise history. The Committee noted that it was over 10 years since the theft from Specsavers and that the concerns since relate specifically to the original dishonesty. The Committee noted that the first restoration Committee had considered all the written evidence that this Committee had before it save for the Applicant's erasure statement, NHSE statement, and character references, and had addressed those issues in their determination. The Committee acknowledged the Applicant's hard work in turning his life around and his desire to return to the register. Finally, the Committee recognised that the Applicant appeared unrepresented and considered his evidence in that light.
34. However, the Committee considered that although the Applicant had made efforts to demonstrate insight, this was unconvincing in light of his oral evidence before this Committee. The Applicant in his oral evidence told the Committee that [redacted], a director at Specsavers, suggested that he take money as a loan from Specsavers [redacted], and to keep this as a confidential and informal arrangement between the two of them. The Applicant did not mention he was loaned the money by Specsavers when interviewed originally by the loss prevention officer. He also did not mention the loan arrangement to the FTPC at his substantive hearing on 20 January 2015. Essentially the Committee noted that the Applicant denied under oath the original theft leaving the Committee with challenges as to his level of insight and acceptance of his original dishonesty.
35. The Committee noted that the first time the Applicant makes mention of a loan arrangement since the allegations came to light in 2013 was in his letter of 16 January 2017. This letter was written in response to NHS England's letter of 30 December 2016 which raised concerns that the Applicant had provided untrue information as part of his application for a GOS contract. The Committee noted that there would have been a benefit to deny the original theft allegation at that time and there was a reasonable assumption that his response to NHS England would not be seen by anyone else.

36. The Committee carefully considered the contents of the Applicant's letter to NHS England and determined that the Applicant was not fully accepting of the allegations he had admitted before the FTPC on 20 January 2015. The Applicant told NHS England that he had an agreement with [redacted] that he could have the money as a loan. He said, "Yes, I was accused of theft from Specsavers [redacted], but the truth is I DID NOT steal anything from them nor anyone else...I tried to say I DID NOT STEAL ANYTHING. YOUR STORE DIRECTOR LOAN ME THE EFFING MONEY... He said it was me vs the founder of specsavers and they have the financial means to fight this. So there was absolutely nothing I can do but go with it" ... "BUT I AM NOT A THIEF, AND I DID NOT STEAL ANYTHING FROM ANYBODY" (Applicant's emphasis).
37. In his oral evidence before the Committee, the Applicant maintained that he was loaned the money from Specsavers with the consent of [redacted]. The Applicant had therefore changed his account from what he had told the FTPC at his substantive hearing in 2015. In the Committee's view, the Applicant's account sought to minimise his dishonest behaviour.
38. The Committee noted that in the email of 14 October 2013 to his employers, the Applicant accepted full responsibility for the theft and said, 'I AM NOT DENYING ANYTHING THAT I DID'. The Committee also noted that in the same email the Applicant criticised [redacted] and made a formal complaint about him to Specsavers. The Committee concluded that the Applicant's account under oath of events relating to the alleged loan and his failure to declare this to the Specsavers investigators or the FTPC and his alleged protection of [redacted], despite having made a formal complaint against him previously, was not credible.
39. In relation to the Applicant's use of the protected title of 'Optician' on the Companies House website in 2017, the Committee determined that it was plausible the Applicant had not received the Council's letter of 15 August 2017 due to his personal circumstances and [redacted] in early 2017, and there being no forwarding address for his post. The Committee had no evidence to counter the Applicant's position that he had registered the company in 2014, when he was a registered Dispensing Optician, and had simply forgotten to amend the registration by 2017. The Committee noted that the responsibility for the accuracy of any entry to him relating to Companies House lay with him as the director of the company but accepted the Applicant's evidence that it was an oversight.

#### Remediation and risk of repetition

40. The Committee acknowledged that whilst findings of dishonesty are difficult to remediate, the risk of repetition may reduce, the longer the behaviour remains

unrepeated if there is commitment to change and meaningful reflection over time.

41. The Committee considered that, in principle, the misconduct is remediable. The Applicant told the Committee in his oral evidence how he would act differently in the future if he was faced with [redacted], and what measures he had put in place to prevent a recurrence of his misconduct.
42. However, the Applicant's oral evidence under oath to the Committee and his communication with NHS England had sought to minimise his misconduct and the Applicant had also provided untrue information to NHS England by answering "no" in the GOS form to the question of whether he had been the subject of an investigation into his professional conduct where the outcome was adverse.
43. Despite the passage of time since the Applicant's erasure, the Applicant's conduct since did not reassure the Committee as to his integrity and honesty. Accordingly, there remained a risk of repetition of the misconduct. The Committee concluded that until the Applicant fully addresses his insight, he was unlikely to be able to fully remediate his misconduct.
44. The Committee noted that the Applicant has kept up to date with his Continuing Professional Development and remained within the profession and is practising as an Optical Assistant.

#### Whether restoration will meet the statutory overarching objective

45. Having made the above findings, the Committee had regard to the statutory overarching objective. The Committee carefully balanced its findings against whether restoring the Applicant to the register will meet the overarching objective.
46. The Committee was mindful of the serious findings that led to the Applicant's erasure in 2015. For the reasons it has already set out, with limited evidence of insight and remediation in relation to the dishonest misconduct, the Committee concluded that the Applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that the public would be safe if he were to return to practise. The Committee took the view that the public would be concerned to learn that a Dispensing Optician who acted dishonestly, abused his position of trust, and considered his conduct since his erasure, was permitted to return to the register unrestricted, despite an inadequate level of insight and remediation. The Committee concluded that in all the circumstances, restoring the Applicant to the register would be inconsistent with promoting and maintaining professional standards of conduct in the profession.

Conclusion

47. Having carefully considered the evidence and specific circumstances of this case, the Committee was not satisfied that the Applicant is fit to return to the register.
48. Accordingly, the Committee refused the Applicant's application to be restored to the register of Dispensing Opticians.
49. It remains open for the Applicant to reapply for restoration of his name to the register. If he wishes to do so, he must wait at least 12 months from the date of his application before submitting any further application.

The Committee determined that Vishnu Parasram should not be restored to the register of Dispensing Opticians

**Chair of the Committee: Gaon Hart**



Signed

Date 19 March 2025

<b>FURTHER INFORMATION</b>
<b>Transcript</b>
A full transcript of the hearing will be made available for purchase in due course.
<b>Appeal</b>
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).
<b>Professional Standards Authority</b>
<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.</p> <p>Where a registrant can appeal against a decision, the Authority has 40 days, beginning with the day which is the last day in which you can appeal. Where a registrant cannot appeal against the outcome of a hearing, the Authority's appeal period is 56 days beginning with the day in which notification of the decision was served on you. 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 <a href="http://www.professionalstandards.org.uk">www.professionalstandards.org.uk</a> or by telephone on 020 7389 8030.</p>
<b>Effect of orders for suspension or erasure</b>
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.
<b>Contact</b>
If you require any further information, please contact the Council's Hearings Manager at Level 29, One Canada Square, London, E14 5AA or by telephone, on 020 7580 3898.