

**Tales of the Un-Inspected
Home Number 108
By Eileen Chubb
(Copyright of Eileen Chubb Jan 2012)**

This Report is more detailed because documents were obtained under Freedom of Information and evidence from the case of resident P. This report shows that every single safeguard currently used is worth nothing. It is a damning indictment of all those Authorities charged with protecting the vulnerable.

The Local Authority, the CQC and the Police.

What is clearly demonstrated is what happens when a relative raises concerns about abuse in a care home, not only is nothing done about it but secret documentation I have obtained not only reveals a catalogue of incompetence but a worrying culture of complacency within the CQC who for example on being informed that a vulnerable elderly resident had suffered injuries after being kicked by care staff respond in an email with,

“We Will Have To Fill In the Lovely Safeguarding Form”

The human being who suffered this assault at the hands of those paid to care for her is seen as no more than a paperwork inconvenience.

The following account is just one of the cases brought to the attention of the Authorities.

Resident P,

May 2010. This lady was admitted to home 108 from hospital and the family was told it was a temporary placement until an assessment could take place. The family was unhappy with the home and decided to move P as soon as this assessment was completed.

This happened in August and P was placed in another home. The family then wrote to the London Borough of L raising concerns and the Council asked the home to investigate them and when they found themselves not guilty, the family once again wrote to Council L who agreed to investigate.

The family gave detailed comprehensive accounts and provided clear documentary evidence, the concerns fell under four categories,

1. Financial Abuse, Fraud, Theft.

Falsified Receipts for substantial amounts of money for services P never received such as numerous weekly Magazines and Newspapers and Hairdressing.

The family felt that the consistent pattern of fraud made error impossibility and therefore was an indication that the other residents in the home could also have been defrauded.

The Council Investigation? Concluded poor record keeping, no other resident's records were checked. In Spite of the evidence such as the invoices which had been clearly deliberately forged as P was charged the same amount for different time periods and different items. The care records when obtained stated that P used to enjoy reading books years ago but was no longer able to. Not a single reference to her reading anything is made in the daily records nor is a hairdressing appointment ever referred to. The family has been requesting the home provide all financial records but the home continues to ignore these requests. The home is found not guilty of any wrong based on the homes say so whilst ignoring comprehensive documentary evidence to the contrary.

2. Staffing Issues.

Not enough staff working.

Residents needing help ignored.

Manager Rude and Dismissive and never left chair in office.

Staff talking to each other in various languages in front of residents.

Staff who could not be understood.

Poor attitude to care.

The Investigation? The council asked the home manager, who denied the allegations and the homes word was taken.

3. Care.

Highly distressed residents needing care ignored.

Left to sit in front of TV with shopping channel on all day.

Activities that consisted of a staff member singing the same song at residents out of tune.

Food served cold, in scant amounts and of poor quality.

Staff saw licking fingers in between handing out cakes.

Residents filthy, dirty clothing, unwashed hair matted and dirty and

totally neglected.

Younger residents with mental health issues mixed in with frail dementia sufferers, high risk of harm of younger resident lashing out at frail elderly residents no staff about.

Residents told abruptly to sit down when they moved.

The Investigation? The home said not guilty and their word taken.

3 Environment.

Bedroom cold and no means to turn on heating, light faulty plunging the room into darkness without warning.

Trip hazard at top of stairs from lounge to garden.

Residents left sitting in blazing sun with no protection.

Investigation? Did not look at heating or light or any bedrooms, the home said not guilty and the homes say so good enough. None of the above concerns were noted in writing to have any Safeguarding implications.

The family of resident P were told there were no other concerns known about this home, the inference being the family were being unreasonable.

THE POLICE INQUIRY RESIDENT P.

The family had requested in writing that Council L should inform the police regarding the theft and fraud issues, this was not done. The family wrote to the Commissioner for police giving a detailed account of events and enclosing all the falsified receipts. This resulted in the local police ringing the family to inform them that the police had concluded their investigation which is detailed below,

- 1. The investigating officer did not look at the falsified records as they had not been forwarded to them from Scotland Yard and they did not request them.**
- 2. They rang the care home and asked them if they did anything illegal and the home said no.**
- 3. They rang Council L who had failed to investigate and asked them if**

their investigation conclusion of sloppy paperwork was correct and of course Council L said yes.

4. They did not interview the people responsible for the false invoices. In fact they did not interview anyone at all.

No investigation took place apart from these phone calls to the very people who had a vested interest in the matter going no further. The family was informed there were no other concerns about the home known to the police.

WHAT THE COUNCIL, CQC AND THE POLICE KNEW ABOUT THIS HOME AND KEPT SECRET.

A Freedom of Information request was made to CQC for information about any concerns raised about home 108 for a two year period was refused, a second request was successful and the following was discovered.

CONCERNS RAISED IN 2009.

- 1. May 2009, safeguarding inquiry after one resident assaults another.**
- 2. June 2009. Resident's trashes room after aggressive outburst and assault on staff and another resident causing concussion.**
- 3. June 2009, Report from a relative that records are being falsified.**
- 4. July 2009, Email from member of public to CQC saying they visited the home looking for a place for their relative and said the following,
The manager was rude, abrupt and evasive,
That the smell of urine was so bad she nearly passed out,
Had concerns about safety aspects, cannot believe it is rated two stars,
wants something done.**
- 5. I week later on July 21st 2009, Anonymous caller saying home run very poorly and cites the following,
Staff talking to each other in foreign languages,
Resident seen left face down in food and later fell from chair and needed to be taken to hospital.**

**Staffing levels extremely low,
Residents not washed, left to walk around wet,
Urine and feaces left on chairs,
Staff bring their children into work.**

6 August 2009, Serious injury to resident who tripped over hazard in lounge doorway. Face bruised, cut and fractured arm which was not discovered until next day. Investigation into why ambulance not summand will take place.

7. Relative says they entered unlocked door at night and got to other end of building without coming across any staff.

8. October 2009, safeguarding inquiry into unexplained injuries.

9. November 2009, Relative told concerns about abuse and neglect not upheld.

10. December 2009, Inquiry upholds neglect allegations.

CONCERNS RAISED IN 2010.

1. Jan 2010, Staff arrested after kicking resident, email from CQC to Council L says in response to being informed, "Will have to fill in lovely safeguarding form"

2. June 2010, Local Hospital make safeguarding alert after resident admitted from home.

3. 16th of June police visit home after safeguarding alert re broken femur.

4. July 2010, Resident sexually assaulted by another resident complaint upheld.

5. December 2010, Inquiry into relatives concerns, Took relative from home in state of neglect lost weight, not cared for, feet filthy and stank.

CONCERNS REPORTED IN 2011.

- 1. Feb 2011 email stating concerns raised by family of resident P are considered as having no adult protection implications. Not upheld.**
- 2. April Relatives raises concerns about abuse and neglect, not upheld.**
- 3. June 23rd 2011 injuries to resident consistent with bite and scratch injuries not upheld.**
- 4. June 2011, Hospital alert Council L, resident admitted with neglected necrotic bedsores.**
- 5. Aug 2011 anonymous caller identified as staff by information, saying they have had to leave residents in soiled pads because new manager is rationing them and gets a bonus for staying within budget, says the food has got worse and consists of mainly sandwiches. Not upheld.**
- 6. September 2011. Anonymous caller concerned about lack of continence pads and pressure care.
Email from Council L to CQC says,
“I do not share your confidence in the home to investigate them in this matter”
CQC investigate, not upheld.**

November 2011, CQC have to inspect home after extensive concerns raised that,

**There is a lack of respect,
Care and welfare
Lack of food,
Safeguarding from abuse,
Cross infection and monitoring of care provision,**

Home says not true, CQC speak to one relative and conclude home meeting all requirements.

Two ongoing safeguarding investigations currently taking place and still people suffer but not enough for the Authorities to act.

By coincidence I was asked to speak in this borough a few years ago and shared the platform with social services who said “Abuse does not

happen in this Borough” Abuse is never upheld in this Borough would have been more accurate.

The Authorities are still placing vulnerable elderly people in this home.

Eileen Chubb.