

Blackmail, Greed and Revenge Versus Genuine Whistleblowing

By Eileen Chubb©

Contents.

- . Anonymised evidence from ten thousand Whistleblowers who have contacted the Compassion in Care Helpline
- . Trends that have emerged from our Whistleblower evidence
- . Anonymised real life case studies from genuine whistleblowers
- . Tribunal cases
- . Shocking evidence of exploitation and dishonesty by those in Positions of power
- . Real life case studies of those who have suffered and who is ultimately responsible for that suffering
- . An in-depth analysis of the current situation

Most of all, this report aims to ensure that the voices of genuine whistleblowers are heard, that those who serve themselves are exposed, that the truth prevails, but most of all that the victims who have suffered and continue to suffer, is the driving force for whistleblowing protection that actually protects those whose lives depend on a whistleblower being heard.

This report is dedicated to all those who have suffered abuse and neglect, needlessly lost their lives, been financially exploited, suffered injustice, and endured harm of any kind because a whistleblower was ignored. For all their families, who continue to suffer today and every day.

For Edna

“Whistleblowing is not about me or mine, it’s about you and yours, stand up for Edna today, because tomorrow Edna will be you or yours”

Eileen Chubb 2019

Part One

The Current Situation.

Our concerns about the conduct of those influencing whistleblowing law are well documented. Our evidence continues to expose a worrying culture that permeates both WBUK and all those other whistleblowing organisations and charities that have engaged with them or are inter-connected to them.

Fact: Our helpline evidence is based on ten thousand Whistleblower cases and clearly shows that 94% of all whistleblowers cannot access the laws protection.

Fact: We have repeatedly raised concerns with all the relevant authorities that WBUK were only interested in whistleblower cases that were going to Tribunal as this is where the profit lay.

Fact: Our concerns have been, and continue to be ignored by Government and other agencies. We have copies of all correspondence.

Fact: There is comprehensive evidence on both the WBUK and The APPG on Whistleblowing twitter accounts promoting the completely false narrative that, *“Most Whistleblowers are senior professionals.”*

Fact: The Helpline data from both Compassion in Care, covering Health and Social Care and from the Whistler, covering all other sectors, shows that 91% of the ten thousand Whistleblowers contacting us are from junior, front line or low paid positions.

Fact: Our earlier published evidence highlighting comprehensive concerns from whistleblowers who had previously contacted WBUK and were not contacted back, is from whistleblowers in low paid, junior positions.

[The Naked Truth](#)

[The Misconduct Of WBUK](#)

The above is just a small sample of the comprehensive evidence available on our website.

The WBUK and the APPG on whistleblowing proposed, Office for the Whistleblower, law, is aimed at just 6% of whistleblowers and the evidence shows it very likely that a good proportion of that 6% would not be genuine whistleblowers at all. We deal with this in more detail in section three of this report.

Section Two details our response to statements made by Baroness Kramer, who resigned from the APPG on whistleblowing shortly after we published our response.

Section Two

Response To Office for The Whistleblower Debate

Friday 25th June 2021

A Report by Eileen Chubb © Dec 2021

Please note Due to helpline obligations, this is our first opportunity to respond to the assertions made in this debate.*

As with all the work of Compassion in Care, this report is evidenced based.

Introduction

We have previously fully responded to all proposed UK Whistleblowing laws. The office for the whistleblower proposal has required further responses due to the serious risk it poses to our beneficiaries.

Our helpline data shows that over 94% of over 9 thousand whistleblowers contacting our helpline cannot access the laws protection. This is the tip of the iceberg. Those contacting us and the Whistler, are predominantly frontline workers, on low pay, with little or no savings; they have no buffer, their courage is all the more extraordinary because of their circumstances. Every day I speak to genuine whistleblowers, who want above all else for the abuse, harm, and other wrongdoing to be stopped.

The existence of this 94% shames the law, the government and most of all those who see whistleblowers as a personal opportunity for their own agenda. Baroness Kramer, WBUK, the APPG on whistleblowing and all those connected with them, have repeatedly denied the existence of the 94% for one reason only, there is no profit to be made from them. This 94% have no value to anyone other than those whose lives depend on these whistleblowers being heard, perversely the very essence of whistleblowing is putting others before self, is under attack by those who put their own agenda first.

This report will use Baroness Kramer's own words as recorded in Hansard to prove the dishonesty and the lies involved.

The 94% are not heard in parliament because they do not have the financial clout to gain access, to fund an APPG or to push through a law.

*The office for the Whistleblower, the APPG on Whistleblowing and its secretariat, WBUK are ethically and financially compromised on an unprecedented scale. We ask only that you read the text of the debate, taken from Hansard and compare it to the factual, incontrovertible evidence that fully contradicts the assertions being made by **Baroness Kramer**.*

***Baroness Kramer**, “The scandals exposed by whistleblowers range from care homes, the NHS, policing, the prison service and transport projects to **financial institutions**-many of those unfortunately -and many private companies. Research by the chartered institute of **fraud** has found that 42% of all internal **fraud** is identified by Whistleblowers.*

Response, re the sentence “Financial institutions-many of those unfortunately”

This statement is clearly emphasizing financial fraud as the most predominant sector in whistleblowing numbers. This is further reinforced by quoting data from the Chartered Institute of Fraud. This statement is completely misleading and untruthful.

PIDA Prescribed regulators are supposed to publish all whistleblowing reports annually. We have selected some of the most recently published data.

Financial

FCA 1.046

HMRC 13.640 (Due to furlough Fraud) Please Note HMRC states that not all of these cases relate to whistleblowing.

Health & Safety

9. 591

Health and Social Care

FTSU 20.388

NMC 192

CQC Data Unavailable

Healthwatch Data Unavailable

Data Protection

Charity Commission

431

*The APPG on whistleblowing survey published in 2019 stated that only 6.9% of respondents were from the financial sector, with the largest numbers being from healthcare. It is concerning that all those connected to this APPG are using evidence from whistleblowers as a veneer of credibility but are only emphasising those facts that suit. The record shows the priorities of Baroness Kramer, The APPG on whistleblowing and WBUK has always been **financial** whistleblowing.*

This contravenes the rule of law, all whistleblowers must be equally protected by law.

Baroness Kramer

“The first phase of the work of the APPG for whistleblowing focused on providing a platform for whistleblowers to describe their experiences and recommend reforms...Crucially it recommended the creation of an independent office for the whistleblower”

My Response

*Completely Untrue The office for the whistleblower in its current form first appeared on the WBUK website as early as **2015**. This law was always the aim from the outset. To say that it was formulated by the APPG on whistleblowing as a result of evidence collected is entirely untrue.*

Baroness Kramer

“I have never heard of a regulator intervening in an employment tribunal case even though this is where most employees who speak out end up”

My Response

I will deal with the first line of the above statement regarding regulators intervening in a later section.

The false assertion that most whistleblowers end up in employment tribunals is again entirely untrue. Baroness Kramer knew this statement to be untrue, the truth is that all connected to the APPG on Whistleblowing are only interested in whistleblowers who can access the law, they have never been interested in those whistleblowers, the 94% who cannot access the law, yet this is perversely where the **most** injustice exists.

Baroness Kramer's words have betrayed her real agenda, what kind of law do you think, Office for The Whistleblower would be, when the priorities are just 6% of all whistleblowers. A law built on a lies alleged to protect those, who speak truth.

WBUK states that most whistleblowers are professionals and from senior management.

Over 94% of whistleblowers contacting Compassion in Care, are front line workers on low pay, they cannot access the law. This is the vast majority of whistleblowers, the unprofitable, poorly paid who cannot afford to pay WBUK the hundred pounds an hour and hefty percentage from any Tribunal Award.

Do not just take our helpline evidence alone but look at the independent evidence that fully validates what we are saying as opposed to what Baroness Kramer, WBUK and the APPG are stating.

Baroness Kramer clearly states, "Most whistleblowers end up in tribunal"

We state 94% are failed from the outset

We rely for our case on the independent factual Data available, the following is taken from Employment Tribunals and the BEIS Department.

Parliamentary Undersecretary of state BEIS Lord Callanan

"There were 35,000 whistleblowing disclosures made to prescribed persons in 2018-19"

**Please note, those who contact a prescribed regulator to raise concerns, will have mostly raised those concerns with their employer first and then gone to a regulator because no action was taken by the employer.*

Whistleblowing disclosures made to regulators 2018-19

35,000

Employment Tribunal cases lodged in 2018-19

2,599

Even post Covid when whistleblowing disclosures were at an all-time high, only **3,128** Employment Tribunal cases were lodged.

Our evidence shows that the act of whistleblowing to a prescribed regulator results in whistleblowers being constructively dismissed. It's the act of going to a regulator that is viewed as the ultimate treachery.

*Baroness Kramer has made no error, she has lied in the process of pushing through her law. It is hard enough being a whistleblower, imagine struggling to live, trying to access justice but being failed because you did not save up before reporting abuse; and then you hear the words of Baroness Kramer, **“Most whistleblowers end up in Employment Tribunals”***

Baroness Kramer, The APPG on Whistleblowing and WBUK and all those who have engaged and given credence to them, have all aided and abetted this dishonesty and gross injustice.

Most whistleblowers resign because they cannot continue to work in such hostile conditions. Most whistleblowers are not sacked they are targeted until they break, they go sick with stress and are forced to resign.

If you want to read more about what its like to work in such hostile conditions, I suggest you read [Dismantling the facade](#)

Baroness Kramer

“One objection raised in opposition to creating an office for the whistleblower is the cost it would take to set up and run, to that I say this: the money lost through scandals corruption far outweighs the cost it would take to run this office. But in pounds, shillings and pence, the financial penalties from one successful prosecution of financial abuse would pay for the office for years- a good example is the £45 million fine from the Lloyds reading fraud case”

My Response *If ten whistleblowers contacted, (OFTW) The Office for The Whistleblower, 2 cleaners, 5 care workers, 1 student nurse and 2 financial sector whistleblowers, would all these ten staff members have equal access to justice?*

When the existence of such an organisation as OFTW depends solely for its income on fines from the prosecution of financial/banking sector cases.

Would there be any underlying prejudice in how some of these 10 cases were supported?

Could there be a blatant flaw in the logic being put forward?

*Of course, the system would favour those cases that were the most lucrative, these are the cases that would pay the wages of the OFTW, and any crumbs left will be thrown to everyone else. The 94% are worthless in the bigger picture. This is why Baroness Kramer, WBUK and the APPG on whistleblowing highlight **fraud** and **financial** whistleblowing so much, why they deny the very existence of the 94%.*

*If a case of alleged whistleblowing is asking for damages in the region of a million pounds, are WBUK currently more likely to support such cases? The answer to this is yes, it's clearly evidenced on the record. They have no interest at all in the 94%, in fact WBUK have publicly stated, that" **Most whistleblowers are professionals from senior management positions.** "*

This is the lie that betrays the 94%, the deliberate denial of their existence. This false narrative contaminates all those connected to the office for whistleblower, whose only allegiance is their own self-interest, no matter what the cost. But the cost is paid with human suffering every hour, of every day across this country. After every avoidable scandal, avoidable loss of life, national disaster, people will ask, how could this happen? This is exactly why, when the UK had a chance to change things, they allowed lies and greed to prevail.

Baroness Kramer

"I have never heard of a regulator intervening in an Employment Tribunal case"

My Response

Baroness Kramer is well aware of the BUPA 7 case, it was the very first PIDA case and has been extensively written about, including two books.

The Office for the Whistleblower relies on the myth that they would ensure regulators acted on whistleblowers concerns, leaving aside all the evidence we have gathered regarding the fundamental failures of regulators.

Let's imagine a perfect case example, a case where all the wrong doing was investigated robustly and upheld and where a regulator intervened in an Employment Tribunal case,

Would that be enough to stop the abusers continuing to harm?

The regulators evidence to the Tribunal was that BUPA secretly redeployed the most dangerous abuser to other BUPA homes against the regulators recommendations. The abuse continued and was later exposed in the media.

Would that be enough for the whistleblowers to obtain Justice?

The evidence from the prescribed regulator was ignored and the judge gave assurances to BUPA that the regulators inquiry report, which fully upheld the abuse, would not be disclosed in the proceedings.

The PIDA prescribed regulator gave evidence on oath at the Ashford Employment Tribunal that the BUPA 7 whistleblowers were telling the truth about both the abuse

of vulnerable people and the harassment of the whistleblowers as a result of whistleblowing. (Court Statements available on request)

This is the reason that the BUPA 7 appealed to parliament at the time for a full inquiry and why we now campaign for a jury led inquiry into all whistleblowers failed, you cannot build justice on injustice any more than you can build it on lies.

BUPA Seven

HC Deb 15 July 2004 vol 423 c1633

1633

Mr. John Horam (Orpington) (Con) I wish to present a petition on behalf of Eileen Chubb of the BUPA seven and others. BUPA seven is composed of former care workers who spoke out against elder abuse in a care home in Bromley.

6.13 pm
§

The petition states: "That silence is a major contributory factor in elder abuse in care homes and that unless whistleblowers are fully protected, the silence will continue, along with the suffering of those who are unable to speak out for themselves. The Petitioners further declare that the case of the "BUPA Seven" has raised real concerns that the [Public Interest Disclosure Act](#) is failing to protect those who speak out in defence of the legitimate interests of others. Amongst these failings is the fact that if the employer contests disclosures then the whistleblower is left in a situation where the only court that can hear the case has no jurisdiction to hear criminal evidence. The Petitioners further declare that the verdict in the case of the "BUPA Seven" will serve to encourage others not to report cases of abuse, and they note the conclusion of the Health Committee in its Report on Elder Abuse that further measures to make staff aware of their responsibility to report abuse, and to allow them to do this in a confidential manner, may be needed." "The Petitioners therefore request that the House of Commons urge the Government to hold a full public inquiry into the case of the "BUPA Seven" in order to address in full the concerns raised and to ensure that whistleblowers can speak out without fear of reprisal or victimisation and that fear and silence are not encouraged."

And the Petitioners remain, etc.

To lie upon the Table.

On the issue of suppressing vital court evidence in whistleblowing cases, we note we are the only UK organisation that has noted and objected to the clause in the current, Health and Care Act 2021, which would suppress such evidence in future.

103 Admissibility of reports

- (1) *A final report, an interim report and the draft of a final or interim report sent to a person under section 101 are not admissible in any proceedings within subsection (2).*
- (2) *Those proceedings are –*
 - (a) *proceedings to determine civil or criminal liability in respect of any matter;*
 - (b) *proceedings before any employment tribunal;*

Baroness Kramer infers that a regulator intervening in a whistleblowing case would offer some protection to whistleblowers. Baroness Kramer, the APPG and WBUK are

all fully aware of the BUPA 7 case, the first PIDA case made a mockery of both PIDA and makes a mockery of the proposals of an OFTW, this is why the BUPA 7 case and Edna's Law have been the target of sustained malicious allegations made by WBUK.

We cannot say too much at this point on the separate issue of the malicious allegations for legal reasons we do not wish to prejudice a police inquiry.

But we can say that charities and campaign groups who blow the whistle on serious malpractice by those in parliament and suffer retribution as a direct result should be given whistleblower protection.

Baroness Kramer

"I think we can all agree that regulators work hard to ensure that the confidentiality of whistleblowers is protected"

[CQC gave whistleblowers names to employer](#)

We were asked by the Charity Commission why we did not inform employers when whistleblowers contacted us?

Summery

We totally agree with some of the comments of Lord Berkley of Knighton from the same debate,

"I do not expect the minister to agree with everything I am about to say but surely an important example needs to be set by those holding the highest offices in the land instead of which there seems to be a more determined effort than ever to ride out scandals simply ignore wide calls for resignations and tough it out this is relevant because it undermines the principle of accountability...."

Response *We agree with the above comments and ask Lord Berkley to carefully consider all the evidence.*

Many MPs and Peers have been provided with whistleblowing training by WBUK, many would call this grooming on the OFTW, courtesy of a parliamentary pass, which has allowed this deceit to flourish. We do not blame those MPs and peers who have clearly been lied to (With the exception of those who were, or are members of the APPG on whistleblowing)

But we ask those MPs and peers who have been deliberately lied to and misled, to have the courage of a whistleblower and stand up and admit they were misled and call for accountability.

Baroness Kramer, The APPG on whistleblowing and WBUK have lied to both houses, have knowingly put forward a law that would hugely benefit both the funders

of and members of the APPG on whistleblowing, The OFTW will make millions for the compliance and legal industry's.

Constantine Cannon will no doubt be one of the OFTW accredited law firms proposed."

Section Three

Reporting To Regulators

The Law allows for a whistleblower to bypass their employer in certain circumstances and whistle blow directly to a prescribed regulator, most whistleblowers disclose to their employer first and if no action is taken as is often the case in the most serious whistleblowing cases, they then disclose to the prescribed regulator or safeguarding authorities.

Of the **ten thousand** whistleblowers contacting Compassion in Care and the whistler,

8097 had disclosed the wrongdoing to both to their employer and prescribed regulator prior to contacting us

1093 needed to help to put their concerns in writing to their employer and of those **1082** subsequently took their concerns to the prescribed regulator, the remaining **11** asked us to forward their concerns to safeguarding authorities.

I have used two care sector whistleblowers in this section as it was easier to anonymise the issues involved, but the research we have gathered via the Whistler from many other sectors show the same key patterns, whatever the wrongdoing witnessed, there comes a point when the whistleblower is forced to consider going to the relevant authority or regulator in order to get the wrong doing stopped. The courage it takes to do this should never be underestimated. This is a common factor in all genuine whistleblowers cases; they take the risk in order to stop the wrong doing.

The recognition of that courage is exactly why we fight for whistleblowers to be protected and action taken. It is also why we expose those who exploit the genuine and who champion the fake.

*Please note we have fully anonymised all our helpline cases used in this report

Compassion In Care Case One

Whistleblower Anya

“People are not given food or even a drink, its heart-breaking, there are not enough staff to care for people, to get them up and give them their meals or a drink. People are left in their bedrooms all night and sometimes all day, people cannot use the buzzer, they just keep calling out. The owners don’t care, they just keep filling beds with people who need a high level of care, and they know there is not enough staff to give even basic care. The whole home smells really bad of urine. I am afraid people will die, everything is rushed through, hoisting people in the wrong sling or with one person. Some of the staff can just zone out and not hear the calls for help, it’s all I can hear when I am in the home and now, I even dream of people calling for help. I wrote out everything on a piece of paper and went to the management with it, they just said they would do something, but nothing has changed, they still do not act. I need this job so much; I struggle to pay my rent and eat. I have spent the last week without sleep deciding what must I do? I am going to report these things to the authorities, they will know it’s me. I am torn between being afraid I will lose my job and the people suffering, people are so thirsty

they grab at you when you finally have time to come and care for them”

Whistleblower Marina Compassion in Care case Two

“There is a male resident who should have one to one care, but the money is not spent on that, the carer who is supposed to be allocated to this resident on paper, is called away to help with other people all the time and this male resident is left unsupervised, he is constantly sexually assaulting other residents and is very violent also. I have gone repeatedly to the owners; I don’t think they report these incidents, or they would not be allowed to keep happening, would they? In the last week I was told to stop writing these things down in the records. This resident hit a lady in the face when she tried to push him away. People should be safe, this man needs to be in another care setting where he can be properly monitored, I dread to think what goes on at night because night staff only make checks about once an hour and there is nothing to stop this man going into residents rooms, they have dementia, they won’t be able to say to people what is happening to them. I have to go to the authorities and tell them. They will know it is me and will be so angry, I feel sick at the thought of going to work after but what else can I do?”

Please Note* Genuine whistleblowers risk their Jobs by whistleblowing to their employer, when their employer fails to act, they then risk going to the regulator knowing this will identify them. Their working lives are made hell for taking this action. The below are anonymised extracts are from our helpline

cases and are typical of the situation faced by genuine whistleblowers every day.

Whistleblower Peter

“ The details of the client fraud were very specific, when I went to my employer with this information, I made sure all the issues were clearly explained with the evidence provided. I did this because I really thought my employer would act, it never occurred to me that I would have to take the same information to the regulator when my employer just ignored it. They knew it was me, it was hell going to work, the atmosphere was unbearable. No one spoke to me, just gave me angry looks. My boss was unbearable, everything I did was criticized . I really dreaded going to work, it made me ill “

Whistleblower Carole

“ I knew it would be hard walking into that place every day, I knew they would be angry that I went to the regulator, but I never guessed just how hard it would be. The manager screaming at me all the time. I was just so frightened to keep going in there, it made me feel sick with worry“

Whistleblower Maggie

“ If you have never faced this, it's hard to imagine how frightening it is, you are completely vulnerable. From the first you know that there is no way back from this. That you did the right thing only makes it harder, they hate you exactly because you did the right thing”

Whistleblower Ben

“ We all go to work and having friends and a good atmosphere to work in is something I just took for granted, I never really thought about until now, but when you’re a whistleblower you go to work and suddenly you are treated really bad, the threat of violence, the frightening bullying, the aggression is unbearable, you can’t walk away from it, your trapped in this hell and completely helpless. All the time you question yourself, maybe I should have kept quiet, but it was wrong what was happening, I know that, but why am I the only one to say this”

Alleged Whistleblower case, A WBUK case

Tribunal Whistleblowing Judgement 2203125/2020

Costagliola di Fiore & Qadri V Introhive Ltd

Represented By WBUK, Ian Michell QC and Ms Alexander Sidossis

The following case relates to two employees who allege they raised concerns about a product they were selling, Introhive Solution, breaching GDPR. Earlier in the case the claimants substantially changed the details of their originally pleaded disclosures.

Page 18 to 19

“It should be noted that the claimants did not make any report to the Information Commissioner, the relevant regulator, at the time. After they commenced proceedings, they complained to the Information Commissioner in April 2020 about the respondent

not replying to a Data Subject Access request (DSAR) but did not mention the Introhive Solution.

Then in June 2020 the first claimant wrote to the respondents solicitors in the context of some settlement negotiations, urging a swift commercial settlement, otherwise he would report the solution to the regulator and also write to their customers saying the product breached GDPR.

In a preliminary decision hearing, EJ Grewel ruled this obvious threat was “Unambiguous impropriety” overriding the legal privilege attaching to settlement correspondence. In September 2020 the claimants added to their Information Commissioner complaint about GDPR, but without going on to explain how it did this. Several months later the regulator rejected this complaint , on the grounds that the claimants had not given them any information that could be investigated”

This is not whistleblowing it is blackmail. Even After the alleged whistleblowers had nothing at all to lose, they failed to disclose to the regulator and only did so as an afterthought once litigation had started.

At the preliminary hearing it emerges from the respondents that the claimant Costagliola di Fiore downloaded files onto his work computer which included emails from a previous lawyer that had not been paid by the claimant in a case where the claimant pursued a similar case against his previous employer and was awarded substantial damages in an out of court settlement. At this point in the preliminary hearing the judge rules it’s a matter for the subsequent hearing to decide.

The subsequent hearing rightfully rules the claimants case is not upheld. 12 people were made redundant at the same time, it appears the claimants case was that the other employees were only got rid of in order to conceal the reasons for getting rid of the claimants.

Not only have WBUK championed this fake whistleblowers case, but they have appeared on the same platform as **Costagliola di Fiore**, endorsing him as a whistleblower knowing the details of the case and subsequent judgement, they have even appointed him to the senior position of business manager and tech strategy at WBUK.

This is the case of the year for WBUK to champion? They recently stated on LinkedIn that they only take on occasional important cases, so it follows this is one of the worthiest in their view!

The alleged wrongdoing was repeatedly described by one of the claimants as, the product would be able to access employees personal emails. Namely if his mother emailed him at work his employer could potentially access that email. One of the claimants tried to upload his personal address book onto his employers system.

There is no record of what the concerns were exactly other than a very general reference to personal emails being able to be accessed on a work computer. Maybe we are missing something here, but should an employee be conducting personal business on his employers time? Most employers have a policy forbidding this for obvious reasons, your being paid to work not email your mother.

In this day and age with access to personal emails on most mobile phones the issues would surely not arise. This is the kind of case, the office for the whistleblower will champion, ignoring the fact it's not whistleblowing at all, but because a percentage of potential damages is intended to fund the Office for the Whistleblower.

When the motivation for championing a potential case in court, is based on only the potential award of damages, regardless of whether it is a genuine case or not. What chance do those genuine whistleblowers, in low paid positions have of justice? The office for the whistleblower, and all those who have endorsed it, have endorsed a law that is in breach of the Rule Of Law.

Incredibly this is a case that made it to court, championed by WBUK as an alleged whistleblowing case. When many thousands of genuine whistleblowers cannot access the law at all.

We have long raised valid concerns that WBUK were cherry picking cases where the individuals were asking for up to a million in damages, a percentage of which would be paid to WBUK. As well as the 100 pounds an hour WBUK were charging whistleblowers, which we exclusively revealed in our 2019 report.

[The Misconduct of WBUK](#) Published in November 2019

We had just cause to publish our comprehensively evidenced valid concerns that low paid workers were either ignored by WBUK or disbarred from help by the exorbitant charges WBUK were asking from people. It is worth noting that WBUK have from the start continued to promote themselves as a whistleblower support organisation.

It is worth noting that it is only in the past few months that the WBUK website has given any hint of charges by referring to their help as “*Affordable*” this was only added after we raised concerns for 3 Years that they were masquerading as a whistleblower support organisation. They continue to deliberately mislead those contacting them.

We would also point out that one hundred pounds an hour is way beyond the means of most whistleblowers, who will have little or no savings and often be living on statutory sick pay or benefits because they lost their job.

If all whistleblowers were ever intended to be equally protected by WBUK and their proposed law, then why have all but the most lucrative cases been disbarred from any help by the operating methods employed by WBUK? A care worker going to court for a few months wages is of no interest what so ever to WBUK nor will it be of any importance to The Office for the whistleblower.

Looking at the WBUK website versions as well as previous LinkedIn profiles, there is a dizzying roundabout of lies and as each lie is exposed by us, they have tried to reinvent themselves as something else equally false.

[The Misconduct Of WBUK](#)

[The naked truth](#)

A care worker, cleaner, student nurse, teacher, front line workers on low pay would be asking for a pittance in comparison. Where is the justice when the fake whistleblower can access the law, but the genuine whistleblower cannot?

The **Introhive** case is a microcosm of the culture of WBUK, the office for the whistleblower and everyone connected to the APPG on whistleblowing and its agenda, it has nothing to do with the disclosures, the actual whistleblowing but everything to do with the potential damages that could be awarded.

Section Four, The Harm Caused

“Rona is 91 years old and is bedbound, she has suffered a number of strokes and is unable to feed herself or lift a drink to her mouth, she is totally reliant on care staff for her every need.

Rona is so thirsty most days that her thirst is all that she can think of, when will someone comes to give her a drink, her mouth is so dry that her lips are cracked, and her tongue feels swollen.

Jayne is a care worker, every time Jayne enters Rona’s room, Rona cries please help me, I am so thirsty. She tries to grab at the glass held to her lips for fear it will be taken away and drinks the contents in one go. Jayne looks at Rona’s fluid chart and it’s all filled in correctly. Jayne asks Rona why she is always thirsty, and Rona says, you are the only one who gives me a drink. Jayne starts to watch other staff and sees them taking away Rona’s meals and drinks untouched from a bedside table that Rona cannot reach. Jayne notices that staff enter Rona’s bedroom during the day, but very rarely is she given a drink, the staff are only in the room to fill out the fluid charts. Jayne tries to point out to some of the staff, that Rona needs a drink, but she gets told to mind her own business.

Jayne starts to worry about Rona when she is not on shift and decides to report her concerns to the management in writing. The management tell Jayne that action will be taken but the situation continues. Jayne does not know what to do, the other staff are very hostile to her and slam the door shut if they are in Rona’s bedroom. Jayne contacts WBUK.

12 days later, when she has heard nothing back, she contacts Compassion in Care. We helped Jayne contact the relevant

authorities and action was taken in this case. Jayne resigned shortly after this as she was working in such hostile conditions. We told Jayne she could take a case to an employment Tribunal, but Jayne said, *“I don't want to go through the courts, I wanted the protection for Rona when I went to the manager's office”*.

Please note that this is just one whistleblower from a significant number contacting our helpline. What we want everyone to consider fully is in this one whistleblower case,

There were multiple vulnerable people suffering from dehydration and malnutrition. There were a considerable number of resident-on-resident assaults due to low staffing numbers plus many other incidents. That wilful neglect and physical abuse was something that affected every single person in this care home, every hour, of every day.

WBUK have never contacted Jayne back.

Please note that WBUK and all connected to WBUK have refused to even comment on these facts, WBUK has at no time acknowledged or challenged our published reports highlighting the plight of low paid, front-line staff who contacted WBUK and were ignored.

Behind every single one of those whistleblowers are people like Rona, who continued to suffer because WBUK ignored the whistleblowers.

It has always been this charities policy to never engage with any individual or organisation who has directly harmed vulnerable people or caused injustice to a whistleblower and to publicly challenge all such individuals or organisations.

If it were not for the actions of Jayne, Rona would have died of dehydration and like many thousands of vulnerable people who

die in care settings each year, her cause of death would not be questioned.

Imagine being really thirsty, so thirsty that your instinct tells you to go and get a drink, imagine not being able to get to that tap for water, waiting for someone to bring it to you and that someone may not come for hours or days or longer.

Rona's suffering is by no means the worst case involving those whistleblowers contacting WBUK, some of the other suffering is so horrendous it would identify the whistleblowers by referring to the details. Rona's Case was chosen because many of the cases involved serious dehydration as well as other issues and was therefore easier to anonymise.

We have many cases like Rona's, the Charity Commission have told us in writing that "*Our helpline should not be a conduit for concerns about WBUK*" We strongly disagree.

The Charity Commission have repeatedly told us not to say **anything negative about WBUK**. We will continue to alert whistleblowers to the conduct of WBUK and if it saves people like Rona suffering for a single hour, we are proud to do it. The fact that we risk retribution from the Charity Commission for trying to stop abuse tells you everything.

Yes, we are angry about these cases and at those who think this conduct defensible in order to serve their own self-interests and bring in a law that will lead to more decades of injustice to whistleblowers, but most importantly that will cost countless lives and allow so much suffering to continue unchecked.

Edna's law will give Jaynes Employer **one hour to act**, this is the law whistleblowers want. They want the protection of a law that is

an effective deterrent, that ensures their employer will act. This is not something that can be achieved by any compliance-based law.

This is why the APPG on whistleblowing, the MPs involved, WBUK, the academics, lawyers and compliance industry connected to WBUK; and their funders, hate Edna's Law and have gone to extraordinary lengths to silence this charity, aided, and abetted by the Charity Commission whose reprehensible conduct featured in Private Eye Issues 1547, 1548, 1551 for very good reason.

All those who have been supported by Compassion in Care, past and future owe a debt of gratitude to the extraordinary Private Eye for challenging and exposing this injustice, because without Private Eye, this charity would have been destroyed by WBUKs campaign of malicious allegations.

.Every academic connected to WBUK

.Every Law Firm and Compliance company that endorses and funds both WBUK and the APPG on Whistleblowing

.Every MP and Peer involved with the APPG on whistleblowing (with the exception of Norman Lamb) past and present

.Every organisation that has given WBUK a platform

.Every agency and individual who gave credence to WBUK in spite of all the available evidence

.Other charities that knew what WBUK were doing and who nevertheless endorsed them or aligned themselves with their OFTWB proposed law

None of these individuals should ever be allowed to influence whistleblowing law ever again. WBUK have directly harmed vulnerable people and whistleblowers.

Section Five

Bounty Hunting and the US system

Mary Inman is the UK head of the US law firm, Constantine Cannon funder of WBUK and APPG on whistleblowing, who has made millions from bounty hunters tips, a practice which is the polar opposite of whistleblowing.

Mary Inman refers to the UK case of Andrew Patrick as whistleblowing, the case would have rightfully been thrown out of any UK Court.

Andrew Patrick

Patrick was sacked from his job at a wool ware retailer. Whilst seeking legal representation as a result of being dismissed by another employer he mentions that the wool retailer was not paying US tax. Constantine Cannon were only interested in one thing, namely that the wool ware company were not paying US tax. A substantial bounty was obtained for Patrick, who later decided he wanted more and complained about WBUK and Constantine Cannon. Patricks case was about greed and revenge, it was not whistleblowing.

Blackmail, greed, revenge are not the motivations of the genuine whistleblower. Only those with no moral compass would classify a bounty hunter as a whistleblower.

On both Constantine Cannons and WBUKs website there is an article by Constantine Cannon called "Boom"

<https://constantinecannon.com/2021/09/16/sec-awards-114-million-to-two-whistleblowers-including-an-apparent-outsider-passing-the-1-billion-mark-with-a-bang/>

Please note the numbers, the last SEC yearly report cites one billion paid to 207 just whistleblowers.

When you look at whistleblowing numbers on the US labour department's website, compare the numbers with the UK and consider the population difference.

If thirty-five thousand whistleblowing disclosures were made in the UK in an average year, what total would be made in the US?

We have been told by US whistleblowers that the only whistleblowing the US system wants to hear about is that which is convenient to government, the love of money is at the heart of everything that is wrong.

Please note* We have had via our helpline at the Whistler, a number of genuine whistleblowers over a long period of time, who have reported via SEC only because unscrupulous individuals have tried to take their information and use it for their own gain. This risk of being exploited and exposed as the whistleblower is caused by the very existence of the False Claims Act and SEC as it's the information the government want, and they do not care how they get it. It can expose a whistleblower as the nature of the disclosures can be traced to them. It means that those seeking advice are put at risk. We are the only whistleblowing organisation that has ever raised this issue,

The US whistleblowing system can be broken down into four tiers,

SEC The convenient alleged whistleblowing which is really bounty hunting and is top of the pile and makes millions for law firms and those motivated by big bucks.

A few crumbs are thrown to the other whistleblower programmes which the government must at least appear to care about.

The vast majority of whistleblowers whose disclosures do not feature in the official data are failed

The most concerning tier are those whistleblowers whose disclosures are inconvenient, and they often battle the threat of the espionage act and life imprisonment or who are actually sent to prison or into exile for doing the right thing and whose only protection is public outrage across the world.

Mary Inman the pro bounty head of US **Constantine Cannon** in the UK she is also closely associated with an organization called **Parrhesia**, who is intrinsically linked to the injustice caused by **Halford Hall of WBUK**, but which is a report on its own.

Constantine Cannon fund both the **APPG on whistleblowing** and **WBUK**, should the Office for the whistleblower be made law, they will make millions from it.

Navex Global are an international compliance company sponsoring the **APPG on whistleblowing** and **WBUK** a compliance reliant law will make them, and others involved in the compliance industry, millions in revenue.

Kevin Hollinrake MP is a member of the **APPG on whistleblowing** and also holds a formal position in the organisation **Parrhesia**.

Stephen Kerr former MP and member of the **APPG on Whistleblowing** and now Vice Chair of **WBUK**

Protect formally known as **PCAW** wrote the disastrous current UK whistleblowing law, **PIDA**. This law is also compliance based.

Protects main income is from selling compliance packages to employers. **Protect** endorsed **WBUK** and now endorse and work with **Parrhesia**

If you wanted to stop whistleblowers being effectively protected, you could not pick a better bunch of individuals to do the job.

Section Six

Silencing Concerns

We all know this happens to whistleblowers. As a direct result of this charity raising valid evidenced concerns about WBUK, we were targeted with a campaign of vicious, malicious allegations by WBUK, endorsed by the APPG on whistleblowing.

This included the ICO, Police, unfounded threats of libel against the book that details Edna's Law and the most dangerous, the Charity Commission.

We are restricted in what we can say about this because there is an active police investigation due to us providing solid, incontrovertible evidence, that both WBUK and the Charity Commission investigator committed, Misconduct in a Public Office.

What we can say is the damage this caused to the Whistleblowers and families of abuse victims we were supporting.

Perversely the reason we were attacked was because we feared for the safety of vulnerable whistleblowers, whilst some of those ignored or abandoned by WBUK did manage to find us and obtain support, **we do not know how many fell through the cracks or worse.**

As a result of raising these valid concerns we came under a completely unwarranted attack by the Charity Commission as a result of WBUK making malicious allegations. See Private Eye

The Trustees "Our most pressing concerns during these events at the height of the pandemic? That Eileen working on the helpline 12 hours a day and then having to work through the night to answer Charity Commission accusations would miss someone vulnerable, that just one person might slip through the cracks "

Fortunately, no one contacting our helpline slipped through the cracks, but the attacks severely impacted our work, the trustees and volunteers lives and health.

It is our duty as a charity to speak out on any issues that directly impact our beneficiaries and we will continue to do so. This puts us at risk of retribution from the Charity Commission who carry out political attacks on charities because they have challenged politicians and those who hold parliamentary passes.

This report is going to every member of parliament and the lords as well as every organisation with an interest in these issues.

Given recent events with Partygate, and the culture revealed by the thought process, “*that If you break the rules, you can just change the rules*” What should be considered is the ingrained culture these recent events are a symptom of.

The WBUK scandal and the actions of the Charity Commission are but more symptoms of this same malaise. We would like to think that something like the Hillsborough law could have an impact, but the rot has spread too far and too deeply for that, only individuals can change this. The capability to recognise that something is just plain wrong and confront it instead of colluding with it, needs to be restored as does the Rule of Law. We hope that some of those reading this report, will recognise the truth and act.

Finally, we would like to thank Truth Defence who had the courage to look at the evidence, recognise something was very wrong and who published the [truth Defence WBUK report](#)

Taking a stand when you see something is wrong instead of closing ranks is the hardest thing to do, it may cost you everything and often does. This is what genuine whistleblowers do every day, they deserve better. They should not need to be protected from WBUK and the APPG on whistleblowing.

