

From Eileen Chubb  
Compassion In Care

To Data & Information Rights Charity Commission  
Your Ref LW/7000171/c-014507/DPA

Dear Mrs L.W

I am appealing your response to my Subject Access Request, for the following reasons,

1. You have given short extracts of information without providing the whole document they were taken from; this denies us the right to see the information in full and in what context the statements were made. These extracts should have been provided as complete documents allowing us to see the extent of content redacted and therefore denying us the information we need in order to appeal the redacted content.
2. You have provided us with mainly copies of our own evidence, you have **not** provided anything what so ever regarding your investigation, you rely on **regulatory function**. The information we request would not impact on your regulatory functions regarding **other** investigations unless you are stating all your investigations are carried out with the same level of bias and incompetence with which you handled our case.
3. The Charity Commission issued a statement to Private Eye this week in relation to our case, stating “**We are committed to learning the lessons from what went wrong in this case**” Is this statement untrue? How are you to learn what went wrong whilst denying us the information we need to ensure a fair investigation?
4. You rely on third party data protection; we already know who the third party is and what their complaint consists of.
5. The evidence relating to **the third party** in question, (Georgina Halford Hall of WBUK and all MPs on the APPG for Whistleblowing) and **all** the other evidence you are withholding is going to have to be released to the police in the near future and you are impeding a police investigation as well as denying us access to information that upholds our case that serious criminal acts have taken place.

6. **Legal professional privilege** does not entitle you to withhold information I have a right to by law. The charity commission has implicated itself in a huge political scandal, withholding this information only compounds the damage.
7. You have withheld information that includes the full response from your CEO to my MP Gareth Bacon, I am surely also entitled to this information in order to assess if my MP was intentionally misled or gagged with confidentiality clauses in the response.

Finally, I am copying this letter to those allegedly investigating our valid concerns. Given that in the scant information you released yesterday, clear evidence that upholds our case of bias was evident, namely,

*“Internal email dated 10<sup>th</sup> august 2020 -She (Eileen Chubb) called the helpline on Friday too and I did speak to her as she was being very persistent with one of our colleagues. I am going to email her to confirm we have received some information, hopefully that might stop her calling in”*

My Response. We fully cooperated with the Charity Commission from day one, swiftly responding with important supporting evidence that proved we had done **“nothing wrong”** The investigating officer clearly demonstrated she was not interested in any evidence proving our innocence, not reading nor acknowledging evidence and finally compounding the harm by placing a letter on our file stating “We had not cooperated with the inquiry” This is clear evidence of bias and incompetence from the start.

The Charity Commission clearly demonstrate in the above email, their irritation with those wrongly accused, diligently attempting to ensure vital evidence of their innocence had been received by the Commission.

We ask for all the information to be released and appeal your decision to withhold this evidence.

Eileen Chubb

CC complaints at Charity Commission  
Gareth Bacon MP

