Retail Tagger Safety Fatality File



RETAIL COMPANY THAT USES TAGGING GUNS

The person works for a retail company that utilizes tagging guns. While tagging comforters, he accidentally pricked his right index finger after tagging several comforters. The finger started bleeding, so he squeezed it, applied sanitizer, and washed it before returning to work. Another associate informed him that he had also experienced a similar incident 8 to 15 days earlier and had tested positive for a certain condition. Upset by the associate’s uncaring attitude and lack of caution, he confronted him. The associate couldn’t recall the exact date but advised him not to worry. Feeling frustrated, he contacted the CDC for advice. However, since his doctor was on vacation, he spoke to a nurse who stated that the incident didn’t qualify as exposure and didn’t require post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP). The nurse explained that the virus dies within seconds and advised him not to be concerned. Despite the nurse’s reassurance, he remained worried due to the CDC’s recommendation. Seeking further guidance, he reached out to AIDS Vancouver, where his counselor advised him to disregard the CDC’s approach, suggesting that the organization may use scare tactics to prevent infections. The incident occurred 48 hours ago, and the tagging gun is equipped with a needle cover that is used when not in operation. Concerned about the potential role of the cover in keeping the virus alive, he seeks assistance. He is married with three children and expecting a fourth, and his lack of sleep over the past two days has heightened his distress. He asks for advice on whether he should be worried about the situation.