

Dear Mike Fulford, Diane Bittlestone and Leo Docherty MP

We have received your response to our Formal Complaint from earlier this year. Your organisation has failed to respond to our complaint in accordance with regulations, including discussing the complaint with us prior to investigation. You have also determined that the complaint process is over. However, as the complaint is on different grounds to others, we are entitled to a Local Resolution Meeting, in accordance with your own policy and the law. We await the offer of a meeting.

We confirm acceptance of the a meeting with Heather Hauschild on 25 June 2019 at 10.30am. You have stated in your letter that this is not a Local Resolution Meeting.

Your response to our complaint is disgraceful. It contains numerous errors, lies and omissions. For example:

- "On 13 April 2017 Mrs Austen Jones [sic] signed a consent form that specifically includes consent for reviews to take place. In addition both you and Mrs Austen Jones [sic] were at the review meetings and did not raise any objections at the time." THIS STATEMENT IS DISINGENUOUS AND A LIE. We repeatedly challenged the reasoning for the review but Roy Dube lied to us about the reasoning. Thus our 'consent' was misinformed and is therefore invalid.

- The reviews conducted by Meriel Chamberlain and Pauline Dorn are not part of the NHS Continuing Healthcare process, thus there was no consent.

- You use paragraph 184 of the National Framework for NHS Continuing Healthcare as evidence for an MDT. This is erroneous. First of all, Jo Craven stated that she felt the case did not need to go to MDT. Secondly, Pauline Dorn eventually agreed in the Local Resolution Meeting that Jo Craven should not have called an MDT. You have ignored all the evidence that demonstrates that an MDT should not have been called.

- You have still not answered the question as to when Meriel Chamberlain carried out her review.

- "I am not aware of you being considered vexatious." Yet it was within a meeting that you were part of that it was considered that I was becoming a vexatious complainant.

It is very disturbing that you state that, "There are no records to share on the reasoning for the review." Not only does this contradict previous responses to this, your organisation has given us five different reasons yet cannot evidence any of them. Your response, received today, states that there was a legitimate basis for the reviews, yet you cannot state nor evidence why they were legitimate. If there is no evidence for the reasoning for the reviews, how can we have given informed consent?

There are also significant omissions from your response. In particular, the tampering of documents. This is a very serious

matter. As such, I will be referring this to the Police, although I welcome you (Mike Fulford) to call me to discuss this urgently (07737 246282).

I have not addressed all of the concerns and failings within your letter. There are multiple others. However, this gives an indication of the issues. We would like to discuss all the issues in a Local Resolution Meeting.

With regard to our Subject Access Request, the information you have provided for the funding information is not what we asked for. We asked, "Please provide a copy of the funding agreement for Mrs Rachael Austen-Jones' package for the last three years." Thus we would like to know what you have on record for how funding is allocated to the package, e.g. number of hours per week.

We will be launching our national campaign imminently and have in excess of 600 individuals and organisations that we will be contacting. You will be able to follow it on our website.

Yours sincerely

Phil Austen-Jones

PS - Leo Docherty - Is there anything you can do to intervene? We have challenged the reason for the review from Day 1. We were lied to and now the CCG has admitted they have no evidence for their previous claims, yet they still claim legitimacy. The basics of consent include being informed - even now, the CCG cannot even tell us how it was legitimate, in accordance with their own policy.