

Inquiry Synopsis 2010

Summary of Disposed Complaints:

Resolution Mediated

1. Dispensing Eyeglasses: Eyeglasses were dispensed to the complainant, who found the eyeglasses to be unsatisfactory. The registrant offered to provide a partial refund to the complainant. The complainant is satisfied with the resolution.
2. Dispensing Eyeglasses: Eyeglasses were dispensed to the complainant, who found the eyeglasses to be unsatisfactory. The registrant offered to provide a partial refund to the complainant. The complainant is satisfied with the resolution.
3. Business Practices: The complainant alleged that the registrant refused to provide her with a breakdown of costs for services provided. The registrant insisted that it was a miscommunication and wrote the complainant a letter of apology.
4. Business Practices: The complainant alleged that the registrant charged tax on a sight test and did not provide a copy of the assessment record. The registrant admitted the error and refunded the complainant the tax amount and provided a copy of the assessment record. The complainant was satisfied with the resolution.

Undertaking Signed

1. Sight testing (A): The complainant alleged that she was not properly screened and believed she was receiving an eye health examination. The registrant undertook to follow the Opticians Regulation, the COBC Standards of Practice, the Health Professions Act, and the COBC Bylaws. The registrant also undertook not to repeat the conduct which was subject of the complaint and to successfully complete the COBC's Sight Testing Jurisprudence course.
2. Sight testing (A): The complainant alleged that she was misled by the registrant into believing that she was receiving an eye health examination. She also alleged that the registrant inappropriately billed her insurance for the sight test. The registrant undertook to follow the Opticians Regulation, the COBC Standards of Practice, the Health Professions Act, and the COBC Bylaws. The registrant also undertook to remove the billing reserve with the complainant's insurance, not to repeat the conduct which was subject of the complaint and to successfully complete the COBC's Sight Testing Jurisprudence course.
3. Sight testing (A): The complainant was sight tested by the registrant at the age of 83. The registrant undertook to follow the Opticians Regulation, the COBC Standards of Practice, the Health Professions Act, and the COBC Bylaws. The registrant also undertook not to repeat the conduct which was subject of the complaint and to

successfully complete the COBC's Sight Testing Jurisprudence course.

4. Sight testing (B): The complainant was sight tested by the registrant at the age of 71. The registrant undertook to follow the Opticians Regulation, the COBC Standards of Practice, the Health Professions Act, and the COBC Bylaws. The registrant also undertook not to repeat the conduct which was subject of the complaint and to successfully complete the COBC's Sight Testing Jurisprudence course. The registrant consented to a reprimand.
5. Sight testing (B): The complainant was sight tested by the registrant at the age of 69. The registrant undertook to follow the Opticians Regulation, the COBC Standards of Practice, the Health Professions Act, and the COBC Bylaws. The registrant also undertook not to repeat the conduct which was subject of the complaint and to successfully complete the COBC's Sight Testing Jurisprudence course. The registrant consented to a reprimand.
6. Sight testing (B): The complainant was sight tested by the registrant at the age of 17. The registrant undertook to follow the Opticians Regulation, the COBC Standards of Practice, the Health Professions Act, and the COBC Bylaws. The registrant also undertook not to repeat the conduct which was subject of the complaint and to successfully complete the COBC's Sight Testing Jurisprudence course. The registrant consented to a reprimand.

* The summaries (A) belong to a single optician; the summaries (B) belong to a single optician

Closed with No Further Action

1. Advertising: The dispensary was advertising as a full service facility, including eye exams, glasses and contacts in a local newspaper. The registrant apologized and acknowledged that there had been an error in the advertising as the dispensary does not provide any vision testing or eye examination services. After reviewing the information in this file, the committee believed that the registrant's error in advertising was an honest mistake. The committee took in to account the fact that the registrant is not a refracting optician and does not offer any sight testing / refractive services at his dispensary. The registrant also took swift action in having the advertisement pulled and replaced with a revised version. Taking these factors into consideration, the committee decided to close this file with no further action.
2. Cosmetic Lenses: A complaint was received regarding the sale of cosmetic contact lenses by non registrants at various kiosks in the lower mainland. Although the College has no jurisdiction, detailed information packages designed to educate non registrants about the risk of harm involved in the sale of cosmetic lenses were sent to each of the locations.
3. Cosmetic Lenses: A complaint was received regarding the sale of cosmetic contact lenses by non registrants at a gift shop. Although the College has no jurisdiction, a

detailed information package designed to educate non registrants about the risk of harm involved in the sale of cosmetic lenses was sent to the gift shop.

4. Dispensing Eyewear: The complainant was not satisfied with a pair of non prescription sunglasses purchased from the registrant. The registrant offered the complainant an opportunity to exchange the sunglasses with any other pair in the store. The complainant was not satisfied with this and withdrew the complaint.
5. Unauthorized Practice: It was believed that a registrant (dispensing optician) was practicing as a contact lens fitter. The inquiry was investigated and it was determined that the registrant was not practicing as a contact lens fitter.
6. Unauthorized Practice: A complaint was received that a dispensary was operating without a registrant. A preliminary investigation was conducted and it was determined that there was adequate coverage at the dispensary.
7. Unauthorized Practice: A complaint was received that a dispensary was operating without a registrant. A preliminary investigation was conducted and it was determined that there was adequate coverage at the dispensary.
8. Dispensing Eyewear: The complainant alleged that the pair of glasses she received were not the ones she paid for. The complainant was unhappy with the treatment she received from the non optician owner of the store. The registrant was able to provide a detailed patient file that confirmed that the complainant did receive the glasses she had chosen. The committee was unable to deal with the dispute with the non optician owner. The committee closed this file with no further action.
9. Dispensing Eyewear: The complainant had an eye exam and purchased glasses from the registrant. There was an error in the prescription. The complainant was advised to file a complaint with the College of Optometrist's regarding the error in prescription. The registrant offered to replace the lenses, upon the return of the incorrect ones, if she received a new prescription. The complainant had another eye exam but lost the eyeglasses. The registrant offered to share the cost of the replacing the lenses with the complainant. The complainant was not satisfied with this offer. The committee closed this file with no further action.