

1 HEARING AID COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

2
3 **Meeting of the**
4
5 **DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE**

6
7 Held at:
8 70 St Mary Axe
9 London EC3A 8BD

10
11 On

12
13 Tuesday, 7 July 2009
14

15 -----
16
17 PRESENT:

18
19 MR CHRISTOPHER HUGHES OBE
20 (THE CHAIR)

21
22 Panel Members:

23
24 MR PETER INCE
25 MR MICHAEL BISHOP

26
27 Legal Assessor:
28 MR MICHAEL VERE-HODGE QC

29
30 -----
31 MS JULIE NORRIS appeared on behalf of the Hearing Aid Council.

32
33 MR TERENCE WILLIS represented himself.
34 -----

35 **In the matter of:**

36
37 MR TERENCE WILLIS

38
39 Transcript produced by Sellers Legal Services
40 76 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1AA
41 Tel: +44 (0)20 7405 4512

Tuesday 7th July 2009

1
2 MISS NORRIS: Charge 1 Contrary to Clause 9(a) of the code enforced at all material times: 1, on
3 or around 5th December 2003 you were responsible for the audiological care of Mrs Doris
4 Catherine Rowan of 2 Rheidol Terrace, Islington, London N1 8NT. Two, on or around 5th
5 December 2003 you undertook audiometry on Mrs Rowan and recorded the results on an
6 audiogram dated 5th December 2003, (2003 audiogram).

7 Number three, on or around 5th December 2003
8 you failed to undertake or record bone conduction testing. Number 4, you failed to comply with
9 Clause 9(a) of the Code in relation to audiometry, which you conducted on or around 5th
10 December 2003, in which that (i) the British Society of Audiology's recommended procedure for
11 pure tone bone conduction audiometry without masking, using a manually operated instrument
12 (1985), in force at the time was not applied in respect of Mrs Rowan, such that bone conduction
13 thresholds were not determined.

14 Charge number 2, contrary to clause 3 of the Code enforced at all material times; 1,
15 paragraphs 1 and 2 of Charge 1 are repeated. 2, on or around 6th January 2004, you dispensed
16 by oral GN ReSound DE4 Canta 4 hearing-aids
17 to Mrs Rowan, based on the details of audiometry conducted on or around 5th December 2003.

18 Three, you failed to comply with Clause 3 of the Code in relation to best advice in that (i) you
19 dispensed hearing-aids which had a fitting range that did not meet Mrs Rowan's individual hearing
20 loss, in that Mrs Rowan's hearing threshold at 4 kHz and above on the left side and 6 kHz on the
21 right side were outside the manufacturer's fitting range for the aid.

22
23 *(A short adjournment)*
24

25 THE CHAIR: In this case, Mr Willis is charged with two matters arising out of dispensing, carried

1 out in 2004 when he was employed by Sietech Ltd. The investigation of this matter has been
2 bedevilled by the inability of Sietech to maintain records appropriately and because of this, Mr
3 Willis has found himself at some disadvantage. He has however admitted the key features of the
4 code, the first with respect to the carrying out of bone conduction, and the second, a charge
5 relating to the provision of best advice. The disciplinary committee has noted that his patient
6 appears to have successfully used the aids for several years and only recently has been
7 persuaded by another dispenser that she needs to replace them. The committee has considered
8 very carefully Mr Willis' conduct, his current financial position, his long service as a dispenser and
9 the character reference given by Miss Julie Booth. In all the circumstances of the case, the
10 Disciplinary Committee has concluded that it would be appropriate to admonish Mr Willis with
11 respect to both charges and to impose no other sanction and in the circumstances the Disciplinary
12 Committee is not minded to make any order for costs.

13