

IN RIGHT AND TRUTH, WE TRUST

(but regulators we don')

By Eileen Chubb©

5th October 2020

I write this on behalf of all the trustees of the Charity Compassion in Care. The evidence referred to in this statement is taken from the full evidence reports which we urge everyone to read. The links are included in this document.

Firstly, we have been advised to take these unprecedented steps by Charity Lawyers who have contacted us after seeing the events of the last few weeks and who are appalled at how we have been treated by the Charity Commission. We thank them sincerely for giving us this much needed advice especially as it has been given free of charge.

Firstly the purpose of this document is to protect this Charity from the repeated malicious attacks by WBUK, whose targeted campaign will continue unchecked as direct result of the relevant regulators failure to act on the malicious allegations and not even having a malicious allegations policy. As there is also clear documented evidence of, the appearance of bias involved, the Charity Commission are compromised by been unduly influenced by the malicious complainant in WBUK misusing their parliamentary position, there is a real risk of injustice to this Charity by the lack of action of all concerned.

Brief Background Summery

This Charity has run on a tiny amount of income and despite this has published extensive and ground-breaking work, please see our website www.compassionincare.com We have supported over thirteen thousand Whistleblowers and families of abuse victims. We campaign for Edna's Law because we know regulators have failed thousands of abuse victims and Whistleblowers and continue to do so. Regulators who have lied to Parliament, the media, and the public.

This is the very reason we cannot support for example laws that propose to rely on any regulator to investigate Whistleblowers concerns, such as Dr Phillipa Whitford MP's whistleblowing Commission, which would be no different to the Charity Commission, CQC, ICO etc.. in how it would operate.

This come at a time when MPs who had formally objected to the appointment of Charity Commission CEO, have proven to have valid concerns because grave injustice has been caused to a number of small charities, who have been bullied, struck off with no valid reason simply because small Charities do not have the financial means to access legal advice and are a easy target for a Commission that is being run along the lines of “ Strike off on the grounds they are vulnerable and will not make a fuss, and it makes us look good” We have never had a more worrying culture in the institutions that govern us.

On the 18th November 2019 we published the special report [The Misconduct of WBUK](#) as a result of publishing this report we were targeted within days with a campaign of malicious unfounded allegations by WBUK and Georgina Halford-Hall.

If we had to make the same decision again, we would without question do the same thing and disclose the wrongdoing to the authorities. If this charity feared to do the right thing and looked the other way, it would make a mockery of everything we are fighting for and more importantly on what side we fight.

What should not be forgotten is the above report included evidence on child abuse, abuse of vulnerable people and exploitation of Whistleblowers with serious implications.

As all those familiar with our work know, we have exposed the fundamental failings of numerous regulators and other authorities in particular the CQC and safeguarding. We know that there is a complete lack of investigation skills or experience and this has led to regulators causing serious injustice to the public they come into contact with. As a result of our vast experience with the failings of regulators we were very concerned that the malicious allegations were being sent to regulators, whose incompetence made this Charity especially vulnerable given WBUK Halford Halls Government connections and considering this Charity is openly challenging Boris Johnsons lethal policy in care homes that has led to many avoidable deaths and continues to put the most vulnerable at risk.

WBUK made the first of the malicious allegations to The Information Commissioner, (The ICO) Our personal experience with the ICO consisted of a complaint we made against the Health Department and CQC, which involved redacted Subject Access information, a very straightforward case which the ICO concluded that I should have reported my concerns three 3 years prior to being aware of the concerns! all attempts to appeal or complain were

completely ignored. As a result of publishing this evidence, members of the public contacted us sharing similar concerns about the ICO.

Regarding the WBUK Halford Hall malicious allegations, I had no idea a complaint had been made to the ICO until WBUK informed me the complaint was upheld, We did an FOI to obtain a copy of the WBUK Halford Hall allegations to the ICO and discovered that the allegations were not upheld, they were not even investigated because there was no evidence to support them. They were completely untrue. We were asked to write to Halford Hall and confirm we had no information other than confidential information. Something we already done before the complaint was made. The ICO have put in writing to me that they were not made aware of the nature of our work or our confidential helpline or they would have viewed the complaint differently. But the fact remains we were denied any opportunity to defend ourselves, which is of grave concern.

WBUK Halford Hall then made identical allegations to the Charity Commission in the midst of the pandemic whilst our helpline was at its busiest see for example [helpline Covid Special Report 9](#)

We have never had a single complaint against us, the opposite in fact, this Charity is recognised for its very different transparent approach, reporting on all work undertaken each day of the year in our end of year report.

The Charity Commission

From the start we have been very concerned at how the Charity Commission have treated us, firstly we were not even informed of the complaints as only one trustee Maggie Roffy was contacted and at the time she was caring for a very seriously ill family member and may not have seen the email, which would have deprived us of any chance of a defence.

However Maggie Roffy responded with full evidenced submissions within 24 hours and the Charity Commission agreed to inform all three trustees by email should there be any more questions, whilst this letter was needlessly aggressive we were not at all worried at this point as we could clearly prove we were completely innocent and the allegations were malicious. We had asked both the ICO and Charity Commission for a copy of their policy on malicious allegations, neither organisation had such a document. We were at least provided with a copy of the allegations by the ICO but only after making a

FOI request, so we could at least defend ourselves albeit after the complaint had concluded. We asked the Charity Commission for a copy of the allegations and supporting evidence bundles this request was denied

However, it quickly became apparent when 3 days later we were informed by the Charity Commission who claimed that Maggie Roffy had not responded to them. We knew this was completely untrue and the submissions response of Ms Roffy was resent along with the proof that it had been sent 3 days earlier. This loss of evidence and lack of acknowledgment that evidence had been received became a theme. Both Stephen Honour and Eileen Chubb sent fully detailed submissions within 2 days, this involved working through the night in order not to disrupt the charities work. No allowance whatsoever was given to the fact that we were running a national helpline and have over 300 live cases.

The Charity Commission also asked for the last three years accounts and trustee reports, which took 4 attempts of sending via email before we received confirmation of receipt. Absolutely chaotic and time consuming. This all took a dreadful toll on our time especially as we have had no days off at all so far this year due to the Covid 19 crisis and 60% increase in helpline calls. This campaign of malicious allegations is now taking a toll on our health, we are completely exhausted as a result of continuing to serve those who need our help and provide the Charity Commission with the same information over and over again [My first submission to the Charity Commission](#)

We heard no more until we received the attached aggressive letter which failed to refer four of the malicious allegations, we had supplied copious evidence on.

There was no further reference to the allegation that I was selling my books on the Charity website and pocketing the money, when the publisher could easily confirm that all my profits from the books went to the Charity.

I was extremely upset to have been accused of this by Halford Hall as I have sacrificed so much to do this work and have had no holiday for 18 years and have even struggled for basics such as food and clothes because of this work. Also, there was no further mention of the allegation that one of my books was an alleged litigation risk, as we responded with full evidence that the only threats of litigation came from Halford Hall WBUK, but were quickly withdrawn when challenged with factual evidence by ourselves.

This Charity Commission letter gave us the choice of either a video conference call or answering the questions in writing, they stated the work would be considerable to respond in writing, however we made the right decision to respond in writing as we wanted a evidential audit trail. I spent considerable time preparing a second set of detailed submissions approved by all trustees. I kept my response factual and calm however it was clearly apparent from this letter that, the questions veered between incompetence and/or aggressive bullying statements that were not even questions at all but incorrect judgements.

The letter was so aggressive that we had to raise the issue of bias. However, our response answered all the questions fully and politely, we did our very best to respond to allegations promptly and fully and to cooperate fully with any investigation and therefore we answered all the questions several times over. For example, we were asked if we informed employers that whistleblower had contacted us, we said we did not and why without stating the obvious answer to such a question.

This Charity Commission letter includes such blatant statements as our Charity objectives were not what we knew them to be and then completely contradicting this on the following page by stating these were our objectives, we know what our objectives are, the question is do the Charity Commission? given our objectives are on their own website and we supplied a copy of this page. I have never seen such a poorly written, duplicating, confused letter needlessly aggressive letter.

[Response to Charity Commission submissions 4](#)

Our effort to respond to all questions within days sometimes hours with full supporting evidence as we are completely innocent of all charges, has been met with aggressive accusations or impatience because we expect the evidence to be read.

We cooperated fully with the Charity Commission despite our previous experience of regulators as we said this is our first encounter with the Charity Commission, but we have barely hung on to trust as the aggression and inability to investigate and exonerate clearly innocent charities became more obvious.

When I heard nothing back on the comprehensive evidenced documents submitted I emailed the Case Officer at the Charity Commission asking if there was anything further she needed as we were expecting a second wave of Covid and that further huge demand on our helpline. I was told she would update me the following week.

As Friday afternoon came and I still had heard nothing I emailed again and was told they now wanted a two-hour video conference and offered three dates, ALL helpline days. I emailed back and reminded them we had chosen to do a written response and that the considerable work had been submitted to them. We have heard nothing more. We have completely lost trust and given that WBUK have recently spoken on the same platform as the Charity Commission and believe that WBUK have misused their Parliamentary position and email to cause bias in the judgement of any investigation.

We have seen tweets from WBUK to the ICO stating that some charities think they do not have to hand over information (Reference to the helpline information we refused to give)

This Morning WBUK tweeted to the Charity Commission both tweets are below.

Subject:

WBUK CC/ICO screenshots



Given the amount of evidence we submitted proving we are innocent, we would clearly have expected the Charity Commission to have concluded the allegations are malicious and take action against the complainant to this harmful campaign.

Everything we have said about WBUK, we have openly published and sent to all MPs on the APPG members in particular.

Whilst this harassment has continued, we have been supporting more desperate Whistleblowers failed by WBUK and published [The naked Truth](#) on both own site and it has also been published on corruption UK

None of the allegations made by WBUK have ever been made in public or on the WBUK website as they know they are libellous, instead they have chosen to use a circle of dysfunctional regulators to cause the most damage and injustice.

We are aware of the valid concerns raised by those who work in the area of Charity Law. For Example,

**[Serious concerns raised about The Charity Commission](#)
[MPs refuse to endorse Charity Commission Head](#)**

We are publishing this information to protect ourselves from what we believe is a regulator who disregards evidence of innocence, gives no consideration to the beneficiaries of this charity, expecting us to abandon our helpline without any allowance made that we have no paid staff and the Covid regulations prevent us from having volunteers come to my home.

We no longer have any trust in the Charity Commission and are taking these steps to protect one of the most cost effective, transparent, and truly independent Charities in the country. If we were Oxfam or one of those charities with big legal resources we would not be in any danger, but we are tiny, and our only defence is the truth and public awareness of the truth.

We have been asked to consider a number of options including that Whistleblowing is not just an act by an individual, but that clearly organisations such as charities can also disclose wrong doing to the relevant authorities and suffer detriment, malicious allegations and loss of financial income as a result.

We have no regrets in disclosing the information of WBUK wrongdoing, what we would regret is a whistleblower taking their own life after contact with WBUK and knowing we did nothing.

We are well aware this Government and many MPs fear this charity and that is because we have always served the elderly and Whistleblowers and have no conflict of interest, our work is proof of this. See today's (5/10/2020) amnesty international report to which we contributed for example.

We have also been advised to consider taking action against the Charity Commission which would involve asking the Charity Commission for permission to crowd fund for the legal fees as well as taking legal action against WBUK, we are currently considering all the options. What ever happens we will fight for justice,

As for the Charity Commission, they have lost our trust as a result of their actions and that leaves us in a very vulnerable position, we have only the

evidence of truth as protection but the we know from bitter experience that the truth is not enough, there is protection in public disclosure when that disclosure is made to and for the public. We are the kind of Charity the public deserve, and we lay our cause and all the evidence that supports us before the public.