



# NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF BARBER EXAMINERS

## Memo

TO: Board members

FROM: Dennis Seavers

DATE: June 13, 2022

**SUBJECT: Complaint report**

---

Under 21 NCAC 06C .0912, the executive director must “submit to the Board a report of dismissed complaints that he or she has not previously reported, with a summary of the allegations and a justification for the dismissal.” The executive director is required to dismiss complaints for the following reasons:

- The complaint lacks information, such as barbershop location or a description of the alleged conduct, necessary to investigate the complaint. (Before dismissal, the executive director must attempt to collect additional information from the complainant, if possible.)
- The complaint alleges conduct that isn't prohibited by the board's statutes or rules or isn't within the board's jurisdiction.
- After receiving a recommendation from the investigator, the executive director determines that the allegation is untrue.

This memo serves as the required report. By a majority vote, the board may reopen any of these complaints if the board believes that the dismissal wasn't justified. If the board agrees with the dismissals, no further action is required.

### **Complaint ID 411 in Greensboro**

The board received a complaint about an unlicensed barber at a shop in Greensboro. An inspector for the board investigated the allegations, but all individuals at the shop were properly licensed.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 419 in Cameron**

An individual submitted a complaint alleging that one of her neighbors in a residential area set up a barber shop in his garage. The staff visited the residence multiple times but was unable to see any evidence of activity that would suggest barber services were being provided.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 459 in Creedmoor**

A complainant claimed that a shop in Creedmoor had several unlicensed barbers. The inspector who investigated determined that all individuals in the business had either barber or cosmetology licenses.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 475 in Spring Lake**

The board received a complaint that said a business lacked sinks for barbers to wash their hands and had other sanitation issues. An investigator visited the barber shop but didn't find any of the allegations to be true. The shop received a sanitation score of 99.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 485 in Greensboro**

The board received a complaint alleging that a shop in Greensboro had unlicensed barbers. An investigator for the board determined that the location was a cosmetology salon, and there weren't any unlicensed barbers.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 493 in Greensboro**

The complainant alleged that a shop in Greensboro had unlicensed barbers, but as with complaint ID 485, the board staff determined that the location was a cosmetology salon without any unlicensed barbers.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 494 in Rockingham**

The board received a complaint of an unlicensed barber at a shop in Rockingham. An inspector for the board conducted an investigation, but the individual who allegedly was unlicensed was not working at the shop.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 496 in Thomasville**

The board received a complaint about a barber who supposedly did not follow proper disinfection practices. The complainant claimed that his or her child broke out in a rash after barber services. The board investigator was unable to substantiate the allegations, and the shop received a sanitation score of 99.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 497 in Thomasville**

The board received a complaint that was substantially similar to complaint ID 496 and that was resolved in the same manner.

### **Complaint ID 499 in Rockingham**

The board received a complaint that was substantially similar to complaint ID 494 and that was resolved in the same manner.

### **Complaint ID 501 in Pleasant Garden**

A complaint was submitted for a barber shop in Pleasant Garden. The complainant said that the barber was inebriated and drinking while performing barber services. The investigator saw no evidence of drinking or inebriation at the shop, but the manager said that the barber was removed from the shop and prohibited from returning.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint for the barbers present during the investigation, and the allegedly inebriated barber was no longer working at the shop.

### **Complaint ID 503 in Rockingham**

The board received a complaint that was substantially similar to complaint ID 494 and that was resolved in the same manner.

### **Complaint ID 507 in Rockingham**

The board received a complaint that was substantially similar to complaint ID 494 and that was resolved in the same manner.

### **Complaint ID 510 in Greensboro**

The board received a complaint about a shop in Greensboro. The allegation was that an unlicensed barber was working at a salon. The investigator determined that the ostensible barber was actually a cosmetologist with a current license.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 512**

The complainant said that her two-year-old son was getting a haircut and accidentally knocked the clippers out of the barber's hands. She claimed that the barber became angry and squeezed her son's head, causing her son to scream. Since this was a matter for law enforcement rather than the board, the staff referred the complainant to the local police.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 516**

The board received a complaint that alleged multiple issues with a barber, including operating an unlawful barber shop and not paying taxes. Although some portions of the complaint weren't within the board's jurisdiction, other allegations were. However, the complainant only provided a street address, and there were multiple cities in the state with that street address. The complainant didn't provide contact information that would allow us to follow up and get additional information.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint lacked sufficient information for the staff to investigate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 518 in Fayetteville**

A barber submitted a complaint about a letter he had received from the barber shop owner. The letter specified price changes for booth rent and other policy changes. The staff responded that the board doesn't have jurisdiction about contracts or agreements between shop owners and the booth renters or employees. The staff notified the complainant that there may be other entities with jurisdiction but couldn't assess whether those agencies could help him.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 523 in Kernersville**

The board received a complaint from a barber's customer. The complaint alleged that the barber intentionally cut the client with clippers after being offended by a comment the client made. The complainant also said that he didn't see a barber license. A board investigator determined that the individual in question was a cosmetologist, and the investigator didn't find evidence of other problems or sanitation issues at the shop.

Please note that the complainant expressed his unhappiness with the outcome of this complaint and believes that it should have been affirmed.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 524 in Spring Lake**

The board received a complaint about a shop allowing a barber student to provide barber services. An inspector for the board did not find any evidence of unlicensed barbers at the shop.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 525 in Winston Salem**

A complainant alleged that she was denied service at a barber shop for homophobic reasons. The board staff explained that the board doesn't have jurisdiction over this matter but referred her to other state and local agencies that may have jurisdiction.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 526 in Charlotte**

The board received a complaint about the complainant's son being nicked during services. After looking into the matter, the staff determined that the business was a cosmetology salon rather than a barber shop and referred the complaint to the Board of Cosmetic Arts Examiners.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 527 in Greensboro**

The complaint alleged that a business in Greensboro had an unlicensed barber who didn't follow proper disinfection practices. The inspector determined that the subject of the complaint was a cosmetologist with a current license, and the business was clean and sanitary.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 532 in Rowland**

The board received a complaint about a barber providing services in his residence without a shop permit. The investigator was unable to detect any evidence of barber services being provided out of the residence.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 545 in Fayetteville**

The complainant claimed that the girlfriend of a barber began stalking and harassing her after the complainant got barber services from the barber. The board staff referred her to law enforcement or a court for an injunction against harassment.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 546 in Calabash**

The board received a complaint about an ostensible barber who did a poor job with barber services. After looking into the matter, the board staff determined that the business was a cosmetology salon and referred the complaint to the Board of Cosmetic Arts Examiners.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 552 in Lumberton**

The board received a complaint about a person providing barber services at their residence without either a shop permit or a barber license. An investigator was unable to find any evidence of barber services being provided at that location.

*Basis for dismissal:* the staff was unable to substantiate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 555**

The board received a complaint about an illegal barbershop. However, the complainant didn't provide any information about where the shop was located, and he didn't provide contact information that would allow us to follow up for more information.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint lacked sufficient information for the staff to investigate the complaint.

### **Complaint ID 556 in Charlotte**

The complainant said that her son went to a barber and, after leaving, began receiving harassing messages from the barber. It appeared from the complaint that the barber was upset about not receiving a tip. The board staff explained that the matter would need to be referred to local police or a court for an injunction against harassment.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.

### **Complaint ID 563 in Raleigh**

The board received a complaint about a nail spa. Since the matter was in the jurisdiction of the Board of Cosmetic Arts Examiners, the staff referred the complaint to that agency.

*Basis for dismissal:* the complaint alleged actions that weren't within the board's jurisdiction.