

Chris M Williams, Chief Executive, County Hall, Walton St, Aylesbury, Bucks HP20 1UA.
Copies to senior people, the Press and the Public. www.nhscare.info/trevor/taspres1.htm

Dear Chris Williams,

Trevor Saunders

Buckinghamshire Council moved Trevor from hospital, against his wishes and best interests, into a care home remote from all his friends. He should have been properly assessed for NHS Continuing Care by comparison with Pamela Coughlan, before discharge. Neither Trevor or Buckinghamshire ratepayers should be paying for his care. I remind you that the formal request to move Trevor (public since April) was submitted in October 2007. Trevor has clearly been subject to mental cruelty, denial of his rights, and the victim of delay, incompetence and deceit by your staff.

Thank you for your reply of 12th September in which you wrote, "I am looking into this matter and will write again when I know more about it.", and your recent letter of 27th October in which you claim that "... all the questions posed in your letter to me dated 9th September have been answered in the letter from Rita Lally dated 18 September and that from Nicola Swanscott dated 30 September." Your letters both start "Dear Mr Lovejoy".

I had hoped your letter would have included an apology, answers to my questions – rather than evasion, and some progress – however slow – in solving problems caused by your staff. It is becoming increasingly clear that blame extends to the most senior levels.

It is unclear why you and your staff continue to evade my questions :

- 1) when do you plan to rectify your wrong "assumptions" ?
(Robin NOT being the official representative, and Trevor NOT wishing to move)
- 2) when and how can Trevor be moved to a Care Home of his choice nearer to his friends, as he requested in October 2007 ?
- 3) what disciplinary action do you intend for the individuals concerned ?
- 4) have you discussed the case of Trevor Saunders before 5th September 2008 ?
- 5) do you consider any words in this letter to be "unfair", "unacceptable" or "derogatory in nature" ? If so, which words ?

You may not know of these recent events:

Trevor contracted MRSA at the Care Home in which you placed him, and was rushed into Wycombe Hospital on 29th September. His chances of survival were considered slim, and the next day I was consulted again by the senior doctor. Shortly after, Trevor was moved into Intensive Care. I am pleased to report that Trevor has yet again surprised everyone and seems to have recovered to his state before this medical crisis. During this stay in Wycombe Hospital, Trevor's solicitors, instructed by myself, have intervened. This may mean that Trevor is now the financial responsibility of the NHS, until the claim for Continuing Care has been through all stages of appeal, leading eventually to Judicial Review. This could have been the situation last year, if your staff had acted differently.

Your staff should have received the letters from Trevor's solicitors, including the "Form of Authority" regarding myself. Earlier last month I made information public that may be of importance to you and your legal staff. Trevor and myself received relevant expert legal advice long before Social Services were involved in early 2007. If you look in your file, or www.nhscare.info you will see the signed and witnessed letter TASTAS1 dated 22nd October 2007. I request you yet again to consult this document and my other letters.

I have a letter from David Lidington,MP, dated 30 September 2008, in which he says, "I have now heard back from Bucks County Council about your involvement with Mr Saunders' case. I understand that the County Council have agreed to copy all correspondence to you that they have with Mr Saunders but that this does not make you his advocate in their eyes. In other words, they would not be willing to reveal any information to you independently about Mr Saunders case as they would still require his direct involvement". None of the letters from you or your staff state this. Mr Lidington's letter is clear. Is he correct ? Who gave this information to Mr Lidington ? Yourself ?

The above information relates to my first question:

1) when do you plan to rectify these wrong "assumptions" ?

The letter dated 18 September from Rita Lally does not clarify this. We do not agree that "Mr Saunders is refusing to disclose his financial position". Consult your files.

On my second and third questions:

2) when and how can Trevor be moved to a Care Home of his choice ... ?

3) what disciplinary action do you intend for the individuals concerned ?

As explained earlier, this is now in the hands of Trevor's solicitors, and the NHS.

I request that your staff cease being "obstructive" in this matter, and I think it would be helpful if your assigned care worker is changed, with a different chain of command.

I repeat my later questions, not yet answered by yourself or your staff:

4) have you discussed the case of Trevor Saunders before 5th September 2008 ?

5) do you consider any words in this letter to be "unfair", "unacceptable" or "derogatory in nature" ? If so, which words ?

I now refer to the letter dated 30th September from Nicola Swanscott in which she refers to my letter to you dated 9th September. I welcome this letter which begins to clarify what changes are requested to the TASPRES1.HTM page on the web site. She asks that six names of junior staff be removed. She does not ask for any other names to be removed, including yours or Rita Lally. Her letter does not appear to request that other words be removed or changed. For example "... incompetence and deceit by individuals within Social Services". I will give these deletions serious consideration if I receive a letter, with your signature, that makes clear all changes requested, including words on linked copies of letters. For example the person's name in the letter distribution, and the words, "Your behaviour is completely unacceptable " in my letter TAS3 December 2007. Your clarification letter will need to make clear that no other changes are required, and that the matter may be considered "closed" if these changes are made.

These letters from your legal department, and these latest ones from yourself, mean that I am now considering what other information should be made public. Until now, it has only been my letters. I have decided it may be helpful for the reader to see the actual letters from your council. The reader can then better judge if my allegations of "delay, deceit and incompetence" are well founded, and where criticism should be directed. If you look at the web page TASPRES1.HTM you will see this letter and your two letters to myself.

Agreed and Witnessed by:



Trevor Saunders



Terry Kensey

Yours Sincerely,

Robin Lovelock

