BEFORE THE FITNESS TO PRACTISE COMMITTEE
OF THE GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL

GENERAL OPTICAL COUNCIL

F(24)43

AND

SHAHID NAZIR (01-20683)

DETERMINATION OF A SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW
16 NOVEMBER 2026

Committee Members:	Louise Fox (Chair/Lay) Nicola Enston (Lay) Jackie Alexander (Lay) Kalpana Theophilus (Optometrist) Caroline Clark (Optometrist)
Legal adviser:	Alastair McFarlane
GOC Presenting Officer:	Leonie Hinds
Registrant:	Present and unrepresented
Hearings Officer:	Terence Yates
Outcome:	No longer impaired

DETERMINATION

Background

1. At the relevant time in regard to particular 1 and 2 of the Allegation, the Registrant was working in Specsavers [redacted] (trading as [redacted] Visionplus Limited) (SVL) as a locum optometrist. In regard to Allegations 3 to 10 the Registrant was an Optometric Director of a Specsavers domiciliary practice operating as [redacted] 1 Domiciliary.

Allegations 1 & 2

2. On 28 April 2023, the Registrant performed a sight test on patient A at Specsavers [redacted]. Patient A attended the practice as a "mystery shopper" and his interactions with the Registrant during the visit were recorded (audio and visual).
3. Specsavers [redacted] reviewed the recording of the visit. Following the review, concerns emerged surrounding the standard of the eye examination and the accuracy of the Registrant's record keeping.
4. The concerns related to inconsistencies between what can be seen and heard in the recording and the records made by the Registrant. In particular, that he failed to adequately examine the external eyes and recorded entries for assessments that had not been performed on Patient A.
5. The video footage was passed to Mr B, Professional Services Consultant for Specsavers Optical. He viewed the video and the corresponding patient record and subsequently made a referral to the Council on 12 September 2023.

Allegations 3 -10

6. On 1 May 2023, the Registrant had joined [redacted] 1 Domiciliary, Specsavers, as an Optometrist Partner. In July 2023, Ms A, the Retail Director of [redacted] 1 Domiciliary began receiving coansncerns from several colleagues. The concerns related to:

    i) whether his recommendations for spectacles and supplements were in the best interest of the patients;
    ii) whether his eye examinations were carried out to an adequate standard;
    iii) the accuracy of his records:
    iv) failure to ensure safety for his patients; and
    v) whether he might be causing damage to Specsavers brand/profession reputation.

7. Ms A contacted Ms B ([redacted] Director of Specsavers's Domiciliary Services) for advice. Ms B did an initial audit of 17 of the Registrant's records from [redacted] 1 Domiciliary, which was a combination of randomly selected records and those where patient concerns had been identified. Ms B passed her audit results to Specsavers Financial Risk Support Team (FRS).

8. Mr C (Senior Financial Risk Support Consultant for FRS) was asked to carry out an investigation into eye examinations that were performed by the Registrant between May 2023 – August 2023. In conducting his investigation Mr C gathered evidence relating to an additional 30 patient records which were reviewed by Mr B. The investigation and the outcome are contained within the report dated 28 November 2023 which includes clinical findings from two clinicians Mr B and Ms B.

9. Following the conclusion of the investigation report these matters were referred to the Council. The Council instructed an expert, Professor Robert Harper, to independently consider these records and the mystery shopper video.

Substantive – 29 September to 10 October 2025

10. The Registrant's registration was made subject to a suspension order for 12 months following a substantive hearing held on 29 September to 10 October 2025. It was varied by the High Court as an appeal hearing. The order is due to expire on 15 January 2027.

Substantive Review – 16 November 2026

GOC Submissions on Impairment

11. Ms Hinds submitted on behalf of the Council that the Registrant had fully engaged with the regulatory process and has submitted substantial evidence in support of his contention that there was no longer impairment of fitness to practise. She acknowledged that he had undertaken extensive CPD including as to ethical practice and, in addition, provided detailed reflective pieces addressing his conduct and dishonesty. Ms Hinds submitted that the Registrant had demonstrated an understanding of the impact of his conduct on colleagues, the public and the profession and that the Committee may take this as indicating a great deal of insight.

12. As to the issue of current impairment, the Council adopted a neutral position and did not contend that the Registrant was currently impaired. Ms Hinds reminded the Committee to consider whether the misconduct had been fully addressed, to assess the risk of repetition and to have regard to both the issues of public protection and the wider public interest when considering whether there was current impairment.

The Registrant's Submissions

13. The Registrant made oral submissions to the Committee supplementing the 161 pages of documentation he had submitted. He stated that he took complete

responsibility for his failings, apologised for them and maintained that they would not happen again. He detailed the steps he had taken while suspended to remediate those failings and submitted that they were not “simply a checklist” to impress the Committee, but, rather, were indicative of his attempts to “fundamentally rebuild his professional identity”. He submitted that the steps he had taken demonstrated that he had learned from his experience and that patient safety, accuracy in recordkeeping and honesty would forever be at the forefront of his practice.

14. In all the circumstances the Registrant submitted that he was no longer impaired.

Findings regarding impairment

15. The Committee carefully considered the submissions from Ms Hinds and from the Registrant. It has accepted the advice of the Legal Adviser, including that there is a persuasive burden on the practitioner at a review to demonstrate that he has “fully acknowledged why past professional performance was deficient and through insight, application, education, supervision or other achievement sufficiently addressed the past impairments." The Committee applied the guidance set out at paragraph 24 in relation to review hearings in the Indicative Sanctions Guidance.

16. In the Committee's judgment it was satisfied that the Registrant had discharged the evidential burden upon him and found that the fitness of Shahid Nazir to practise as an optometrist is no longer impaired. Its reasons are as follows.

17. The Committee placed weight on the extensive documentation that the Registrant had supplied to it. It accepted that he had done all that had been recommended to him by the substantive Committee when it directed a review, and, in fact, more than had been asked of him. This included extensive reflections in addition to the CPD learning and how he would apply that learning to his practice. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant had undergone a considerable journey of introspection and self-analysis and had reflected deeply on his failings. The Committee was satisfied that the suspension for the last year had been a considerable learning experience for him.

18. The Committee was satisfied that the Registrant had demonstrated very significant insight into his conduct. This included both the clinical matters and the dishonesty matters, which by their very nature were harder to remediate. The Registrant had apologised to the substantive Committee for the approach he had taken at the substantive hearing and reflected on how he had focused on the process as a way to avoid accepting his failings and that he had been dishonest.

> *“The true test of my learning will not be what I write here. It will be how I practise, every day, for years to come. I have recognised the importance of maintaining clear and consistent safeguards in my professional practice. I must assess first and record second, ensuring that no entry is made until the consultation is complete. Truth must always take precedence over completeness. If a test is not performed, it must be recorded as not performed, together with the reason and any appropriate plan. I must never fill gaps with assumptions or copy*

findings forward without checking them against the patient at every visit. Prescribing recommendations must be based solely on clinical need, never on routine, pressure, or financial interest. I must also recognise when I am struggling, when workload becomes unsustainable, or when I need support, and have the courage to speak up. I now understand that stepping back is not weakness. It is a professional responsibility."

19. Given all of the information before it, the Committee considered that the risk of repetition of the behaviour was very low. The Committee was satisfied in those circumstances that a finding of impairment was not needed on the basis of public protection and that the Registrant could return to unrestricted practice at the end of the period of suspension. It noted that he had support mechanisms in place, including a mentor and the Committee considered that it may well be sensible for the Registrant to continue with these, but this did not mean there was current impairment.
20. The Committee specifically considered in the light of the dishonesty findings whether the need to declare and uphold proper standards of conduct and behaviour so as to maintain public confidence in the profession required a finding of current impairment. It had regard to the time that had passed, the two years of interim order conditions that had been complied with, and more significantly, the steps that the Registrant has undertaken in relation to the dishonesty concerns and his reflections on it. In its judgment the public knowing the extensive remediation and very significant insight that the Registrant has demonstrated would not require a finding of impairment on the basis of the public interest.

Declaration

21. The Committee makes a formal declaration that the Registrant's fitness to practise is no longer impaired for the reasons given above.
22. The Committee is satisfied that there is no power under the Opticians Act 1989 to make an immediate revocation of the suspension order. Accordingly, it will continue until it's expiry on 15 January 2027.

Chair of the Committee: Louise Fox

Signature  **Date: 16 November 2026**

Registrant: Shahid Nazir

Signature present and received via email **Date: 16 November 2026**

FURTHER INFORMATION
Transcript
A full transcript of the hearing will be made available for purchase in due course.
Appeal
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).
Professional Standards Authority
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. 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). Further information about the PSA can be obtained from its website at www.professionalstandards.org.uk or by telephone on 020 7389 8030.
Effect of orders for suspension or erasure
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.
Contact
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.