

12/5/2021

To the Charity Commission

Ref; TM/C-535118/RC

Dear Sir/Madam

We respond in full to the letter from your investigator TM Dated 19th April 2021,

Given that we had submitted a formal complaint on 7th April, regarding the grossly disproportionate behaviour of your investigator TM.

We were extremely concerned therefore that TM was allowed to continue working on the case and to subsequently compound the harm by writing the letter 12 days after we submitted serious concerns about this same individual. TM has whilst being fully aware of our concerns proceeded to alter the facts of our case and place on our record, deliberately inaccurate, slanderous remarks. We will now deal with each of the libellous assertions contained in her letter of 19th April.

Assertion 1. It is stated that the complaint came from an ordinary member of the public.

Completely untrue, the complaint has been confirmed by the Commission to have come from Halford Hall of WBUK. The Commission was provided with robust evidence that the complainant was targeting this charity as a direct result of the following,

. We had received serious concerns via our beneficiaries and volunteers that WBUK had failed to respond to a considerable number of whistleblowers resulting in abuse of vulnerable people continuing unchecked; distress to whistleblowers, and that they were operating an organised system of financial exploitation of whistleblowers via a case management business, contrary to the compensation act 2006.

. We followed the Charity Commission Guidance in respect of this, and we reported these concerns to the correct authorities and assisted the whistleblowers.

. WBUK hold a Parliamentary position, their political agenda in attacking this charity clearly involved a motivation to remove both Edna's law and the book detailing the case for Edna's law which would be politically expedient to the complainant.

Georgina Halford Hall is an evidenced serial liar and there is robust evidence to support this fact. The Commission were fully aware of the evidence.

The Commission has a duty to ensure any investigation it conducts must be fair and proportionate and that particular care is taken regarding bias, we submit that care was not taken in this case, the Commission were unduly influenced by Halford Halls parliamentary position and disregarded robust evidence in their efforts to uphold this complaint at any cost.

Assertion 2. We are in a dispute with a third party and are advised that we have a responsibility to resolve such a dispute.

It is completely biased to label the reporting of serious concerns received via our beneficiaries and volunteers as a dispute. This is a deliberate attempt to suppress the real issues. We provided full evidence on this.

Assertion 3 The case could have been resolved much sooner had the trustees been accepting of concerns.

The evidence clearly shows that we fully responded to the Commission within 24 hours with a full and detailed response, followed by further detailed submissions and evidence within 48 hours and subsequently. Our lawyers; Stoneking, will confirm we chased the Commission with evidence. Our lawyer said on reviewing all the evidence that we had submitted to the Commission, that no one could accuse of us of not fully responding.

We immediately acted on the minor admin issues, we also made a large number of changes to our website accepting that as we had to transfer all the content of our old website onto our new site in a 2-day period, we accepted that there were some issues with layout. We used our website budget for the

next year to put these issues right. We have the list of work undertaken, invoices and written confirmation of the work from the company we use. The Commission has this evidence but has chosen to make this blatantly untrue assertion regardless of the truth.

What the Commission object to, is our fully justified and recorded decision refusing to be censored by the Commission and refusing to remove Edna's Law, the book about Edna's Law and any content criticizing regulators or the complainants APPG on whistleblowing.

Assertion 3. We only now have 4 trustees

We have previously had 4 trustees. Two past trustees died and one emigrated to the US.

Assertion 4. The helpline is now running correctly

The helpline has always been running correctly we have over 16k satisfied beneficiaries to prove it.

Assertion 5 the trustees should signpost helpline callers to another service if their not from the care sector.

We have submitted full evidence on this, the assertions are outrageous given all the evidence submitted. We cannot just take calls from the care sector re elderly abuse, calls about elderly abuse come from many sources, including local authorities, police officers and others. Are we supposed to refuse to act on this information?

Assertion 6 We have not complied with the action plan.

We have complied, see the action plan. We have provided fully evidenced responses on our completely justified campaign for Edna's Law. We have given fully evidenced responses from our helpline data. TM does not like our beneficiaries evidence: as it does not meet her agenda to have Edna's law and the book removed. We have done what we have been asked to do, we even complied with the ridiculous request of discussing a non-existent litigation risk.

Assertion 7 we have not included the 3 major projects in the discussions asked for in the action plan.

Completely untrue, we were not asked to discuss the projects at all in the action plan, these projects were fully discussed last spring when we considered what work needed funding. We have always gathered bundles of evidence on our positive outcomes.

Assertion 8 We should be like Age UK or similar.

We have already answered this in full, we do not take Government and care industry money and therefore we should not resemble these other charities as we specifically did not want to resemble them.

We gave full evidence as to why having no conflict of interest as we do not take Government or care industry funding which allows us to tackle the underlying issues that cause abuse.

Re hourglass their former CEO described the force feeding of an elderly women with talcum powder as “Teasing” on national TV. When there was widespread suffering in Southern Cross homes, we were told repeatedly by the media that we were the only charity willing to speak about Southern Cross. Hourglass formally known as; Action on Elder Abuse declined to do so and was taking significant amounts of funding at the time from Southern Cross.

We are gratified to be accused of not having the decorum of these charities, including the relatives and relatives association who were written to by ourselves when they appointed an evidenced abuser as a trustee. They declined to respond. We will continue to be proud to have no conflict of interest or abusers on our board.

Assertion 9 We have been advised re political campaigning

We have never breached any Commission rules on this, we have no political allegiance, a statement Baroness Stowell cannot make nor for that matter can Conservative party member and fundraiser Halford Hall.

Which brings us to the repeated failure by the Commission to acknowledge the existence of our core work, the helpline. Despite the reams of helpline data reports on our website.

The evidence shows we have fully cooperated with the Commission, up to this time, we have been polite in all our correspondence, helpfully answered all

the questions but all to no avail. The Commissions stance has been from the outset rude, aggressive, irrational, bullying, biased and unscrupulous. As soon as we answered one allegation with robust evidence in our defence, we would be accused of a new allegation. TM has been enraged by our robust defences on those issues we rightly defend, namely removing Edna's law and the book and any criticism of regulators from our website.

The Commissions attitude has been extraordinary and such an abuse of power must be credibly and independently investigated. The Commission have harmed our beneficiaries and caused real mental anguish to our volunteers and trustees. The Commission have also forced us to seek legal representation and used tactics such as telling our lawyers one thing and completely contradicting this in writing; resulting in a bill of 8k which we are crowdfunding for.

8k may not mean anything to the Commission, given its been reported they spent that amount on chocolate last December but to us that amount is next year's budget.

Charities should be beyond reproach but so should regulators, the Commission's investigation skills are lamentable, as to their integrity, the Commission have clearly been unduly influenced to the extent their conduct in a public office, as well as the complainants conduct is clearly of grave concern.

We have challenged Government policies affecting our beneficiaries and challenged other groups whose actions adversely affect our beneficiaries, and we will continue to do so. With regard to the abusive practices that we reported that resulted in being targeted with malicious allegations, we would not hesitate to do exactly the same thing again.

Whilst the Commission are willing to completely ignore this evidence, we will not turn a blind eye to abuse in order to have an easy life.

The Trustees