

SPSO decision report



Case: 202410419, A Dentist in the Greater Glasgow & Clyde NHS Board area
Sector: Health
Subject: Clinical treatment / Diagnosis
Decision: some upheld, recommendations

Summary

C complained on behalf of their child (A) who was a patient of the practice. A's care was disrupted by COVID-19 and they were not seen by the practice for four years. C complained that the practice unreasonably charged them for white fillings after there was a delay in A being seen for routine check ups and the care could have been provided at a time when it would have been free of charge. C also complained that the practice failed to reasonably respond to C's complaint.

We took independent advice from dental adviser. We found that the decision to charge for the care and treatment provided was reasonable. It was not possible to evidence whether appointments had been sought prior to their appointment, and the decision to charge for the treatment provided was reasonable. Therefore the complaint was not upheld.

We found that while the content of the practice's complaint response was reasonable, there were significant delays in the practice providing a response and there were a number of times when C requested to escalate their complaint and this was not actioned, which we found unreasonable. Therefore, we upheld this complaint.

Recommendations

What we asked the organisation to do in this case:

- Apologise to C for the delay in responding to the complaint. The apology should meet the standards set out in the SPSO guidelines on apology available [HYPERLINK "http://www.spsso.org.uk/meaningful-apologies"](http://www.spsso.org.uk/meaningful-apologies) <http://www.spsso.org.uk/meaningful-apologies> .

We have asked the organisation to provide us with evidence that they have implemented the recommendations we have made on this case by the deadline we set.