



C [REDACTED] . &lt;[REDACTED]@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Further response letter IAT-12587**

---

Chris . &lt;[REDACTED]@gmail.com&gt;

17 November 2016 at 21:12

To: "J [REDACTED], B [REDACTED]" &lt;b[REDACTED]@herefordshire.gov.uk&gt;, DoLS &lt;dols@herefordshire.gov.uk&gt;, safeguarding@herefordshire.gcsx.gov.uk, K [REDACTED]@herefordshire.gov.uk, S [REDACTED].d[REDACTED]@herefordshire.gov.uk

Dear Ms C [REDACTED],

Thank you for providing your letter of 15th November, via Ms B [REDACTED] J [REDACTED] email.

My analysis of your two produced documents of 17th October and 15th November indicates inconsistency and contradiction.

You will note the detail in my previous reply email were not point to consider but those of fact and current law.

You state "the staff and team manager involved in supporting your brother's assessed needs are happy to consider the details you raise", I remind you that it is not a matter of level of happiness of your colleagues and their willingness to consider detail but one of a legal obligation.

Although you state we have conversed, this is untrue, we have only communicated via email and letter, if you believe this is incorrect, please provide evidence of our conversations.

I agreed that neglect and inadequate care and support provided to my brother and the reluctance to address concerns are taking up a considerable part of my life and time. However there is a difference between us, I do it for love and a duty to a vulnerable relative who struggles to communicate and is misunderstood by many, whereas you are paid to perform a duty in the role you are employed to do.

I note you now state your use of the word evidence does not relate to evidence at all but refers to Ms G [REDACTED]'s recollection of the meeting and her opinion only. I too could provide such an explanation that demonstrates I was not afforded sufficient opportunity to share information relating to my brother. I make you aware that there is a difference between explanation and evidence. However, I would be interested in seeing the evidence to support the demonstration of fact you indicate.

Further, the use of the term Best Interests is one that is not only used by professionals, but laypersons such as I. However, my brother's best interests were to be addressed and at the core of the meetings discussions of the 14th September. To date, the organisational and institutional abuse continues and is neglected by the local authority.

As to my brother's G.P. and your false claim, I contacted the surgery to inform them of such, due to the discovery of documented misuse of medication. I find it highly unprofessional and insulting that you made such a claim concerning my brother's G.P. I note my brother nor I receive such apology concerning your false claim.

I did indeed address the medication administration with my brother's G.P., due to the neglect of duty by those present at the meeting of 14th September to do so, and in compliance with current legislation; that being The Medicines Act 1968.

I note you are now stating there were formal minutes taken for the meeting of 14th September 2016.

Your statement "There are no handwritten notes for the meeting and all information gathered at the time is represented in the formal minutes." Interestingly this contradicts your statement in your previous sent document of 17th October. In particular, please refer to Item 4 of your previously submitted document "AWB response Letter.pdf." (attached). I would have no confidence in the validity of the sudden appearance of claimed formalised minutes, in light of your previous statements and documents sent to me.

For your record, my forensic examination of both your sent document indicate both were authored by S. Humphrey and later saved as .pdf files using software that is over thirteen-year-old. Therefore I ask once more, I request to know what involvement S. H [REDACTED] has in these particular concerns, and what other personal data they may have had access to?

---

Regarding a face to face meeting, You will be aware the meeting of 14th September 2016 was excessively delayed by your authority and H [REDACTED] House with a considerable bias against my brother's best interests, taking since March 2016 to inform me that a meeting would finally be held. Regrettably, this is the stage we are at due to the breach of our agreements at the meeting, abuse of the DoLS order and neglect to uphold my brother's rights; after the meeting of 14th September. Unfortunately, although a Wednesday is a favoured day for me, my role as an unpaid carer must take precedence over your plans and your short notice for a meeting on Wednesday 23rd November; Two prior appointments were in place before your request for that particular day.

Lastly, I am willing to review, for the purpose of verification as you state, the minutes of a future proposed meeting I attend; as all parties attending should have the opportunity of doing so. Please email me the full list of people and their roles, who will be attending a proposed meeting, so that I can prepare relevant information for any such future meeting.

You will be aware that my brother's IMCA and paid representative provided by you did not perform their duty to my brother; in his best interests. I question why the local authority has neglected my brother's rights for so long, appear to continue to do so and are unwilling to speak with me. The lack of ability to sufficiently investigate and uphold the agreements of the meeting are a concern, and of which I shall seek redress.

I look forward to your early reply.

Sincerely

C [REDACTED] B [REDACTED]

On 15 November 2016 at 13:26, J [REDACTED] B [REDACTED] <b[REDACTED]@herefordshire.gov.uk> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]



**AWB response letter.pdf**

180K