

**From:** [Compassion In Care](#)  
**To:** [Standards Commissioner](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Reference PCS1835 Private and Confidential  
**Date:** 07 June 2022 12:58:09  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)

---

Clearly we have provided fresh evidence <https://find-and-update.company-information.service.gov.uk/company/09347927/filing-history>

Again we ask for you to Look at the filing history above for WBUK. These are all filleted accounts. Such accounts are not illegal for an ordinary company however WBUK are not an ordinary company; they are the secretariat for the APPG on whistleblowing and are directly influencing the evidence considered by this APPG and the resulting policy based on that evidence.

If that policy is of benefit to those funding an APPG the normal route is to declare funding in the register of interests. However when that funding is deliberately concealed within a secretariats accounts than those wishing to influence policy have carte blanc to do so without any scrutiny what so ever.

This is completely unacceptable as is the fact that we have had to persistently challenge your stance in relation to this APPG.

Sir Norman Lamb clearly thought that WBUK were not transparent. An APPG secretariat such as WBUK are a vehicle for cash for influence and filleted accounts allows them to operate without any scrutiny what so ever.

This would be an issue of concern for most members of the public, its about time it was an issue of concern for,  
Eileen Chubb

---

**From:** Standards Commissioner <standardscommissioner@parliament.uk>  
**Sent:** 07 June 2022 12:10  
**To:** Compassion In Care <info@compassionincare.com>  
**Subject:** Reference PCS1835 Private and Confidential

Dear Ms Chubb

Thank you for your latest email to this office. In 2019 my colleague Gwen clearly outlined the Rules of Conduct to you, as well as specific rules that apply to APPGs. I understand you have been in receipt of correspondence on this matter from both Gwen and the Commissioner.

As you have not provided new evidence for your allegations, there is still no action for the Commissioner to take. We understand you feel strongly about this but investing additional time in writing to us about the same issue would be unwise as this office will not respond any further unless fresh evidence is provided.

Kind regards

**Linda Hu**  
Office Manager  
Office of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards

UK Parliament, Westminster, London SW1A 0AA  
[OPCS Privacy Notice](#)

**From:** Compassion In Care <[info@compassionincare.com](mailto:info@compassionincare.com)>  
**Sent:** 31 May 2022 15:18  
**To:** Standards Commissioner <[standardscommissioner@parliament.uk](mailto:standardscommissioner@parliament.uk)>  
**Subject:** official complaint



**Registered Charity: 1102282**

# Compassion in Care

**Breaking the chain of elderly abuse  
Complacency - Ignorance - Denial - Silence**



**For confidential support: 07763 066063 or [info@compassionincare.com](mailto:info@compassionincare.com)**

19A TRANSMERE ROAD  
PETTS WOOD  
ORPINGTON  
KENT  
BR5 1DT  
[www.compassionincare.com](http://www.compassionincare.com)  
[info@compassionincare.com](mailto:info@compassionincare.com)

Founder and CEO Eileen Chubb  
Patrons  
Roger Graef OBE  
Erin Pizzey  
Auriol Walters  
# @compassincare

31<sup>st</sup> May 2022

To The Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards  
Our Ref: GravyGate2022

Dear Madame,  
I wish to raise the following complaint about the following individuals.

John Penrose MP. I wrote to John Penrose MP on the 16<sup>th</sup> of March 2022, in his official Capacity as “Corruption Tsar” I forwarded comprehensive evidence in relation to the APPG on whistleblowing. Mr Penrose has not responded at all.

Mr Penrose has not been transparent regarding his association with members of the APPG and a recently published FOI by Dr Minh Alexander discloses the extent of these associations.

As corruption Tsar it’s bad enough to completely ignore evidenced concerns of wrongdoing but to discover this individual is closely associating with those involved in the same wrong doing is beyond the pale.

As John Penrose is aware of all the following, we suggest that his appointment as “Corruption Tsar” says much about those who made such an appointment in the first place.

Regarding the APPG on whistleblowing and all its past and current members we raise the following, The secretariat WBUK provides a staff member to Mary Robinson MP and the APPG on whistleblowing, however as the secretariat WBUK only ever publish filleted accounts, who is paying for this benefit? And why is this information being withheld from public scrutiny? The secretariat to this APPG has a parliamentary pass and has made numerous public statements describing themselves as directly influencing the policy and strategy of the APPG on whistleblowing. WBUK only produce filleted accounts which, whilst legal should certainly not be allowed when that company is a secretariat to an APPG; especially one which is embroiled in the scandal that this APPG is directly involved in.

It means there is absolutely no scrutiny of a groups secretariats funding, effectively allowing vested interests to hide its funding and influence in a secretariats company accounts.

Should WBUK accounts when examined show any funding what so ever from the compliance industry or any US law firm, then given the fact the law and policy that is currently being advocated by this APPG will bring huge financial gain to the compliance and legal industry, then this is cash for influence.

The introduction through surreptitious and completely dishonest means of such a law by concealing the cash for influence in a secretariats bank account is surely in breach of all of the Nolan principles.

The fact that both the APPG on whistleblowing and its secretariate have sought to silence this charity raising such valid evidenced concerns by means of repeated malicious allegations is also in breach of the Nolan principles.

There is also the matter of who has paid for the numerous platforms that WBUK have had to pay substantial amounts to be allowed to speak at.

We have no concerns whatsoever regarding what portcullis emblem this APPG use, all our concerns relate to the fact this APPG is able to operate at all given all the facts.

All of these concerns would be gross misconduct in any other UK workplace. These concerns will be exposed in the near future, and we suggest the above dishonestly is finally acted on.

Eileen Chubb

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.