

Complaints Received during 2025

Resolved at Initial Assessment Stage

	Date made	Nature of Complaint	Outcome of MOs assessment	Review Requested	Review Outcome
1)	17.12.25.	Alleged DPI and conflict of interests.	Decision met one or more of the criteria set within the initial assessment criteria, and did not progress beyond this initial assessment stage. No breach of DPI or conflict of interest.	No	N/A

Resolved at Assessment Stage

	Date made	Nature of Complaint	Outcome of MOs assessment	Review Requested	Review Outcome
1)	10.01.25	Alleged councillor rude, threatening and abusive, whilst investigating a complaint re a local resident	<p>Decision under Assessment Criteria.</p> <p>Insufficient independent evidence as to the conversation complained about to substantiate the allegations. The resident in this case was a friend or close associate of the councillor and was advised to ask another councillor to act in such circumstances.</p> <p>No breach of the code.</p>	Yes	Decision upheld
2)	12.01.2025	Alleged that the Councillor "defamed" their character and "victimised them based on race, faith and suppression of free speech" following a council event.	<p>Decision under Assessment Criteria.</p> <p>Insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations.</p> <p>No breach of the code.</p>	No	N/A

Summary of Member Code of Conduct (MCC) Complaints, Appendix A

3)	15.01.2025	<p>Alleged that Councillor, with another person, visited and intimidated tenants residing there & was aware of the false claims made by the person they accompanied and did not challenge them.</p> <p>Councillor advised to apologise for the misleading statement made by the person they accompanied.</p>	<p>There was merit in the assertions that the Councillor should have made sure the misleading statement(s) was corrected before the tenant acted upon it. This amounted to a breach in respect of the paragraph 6 (respect) of the Code.</p> <p>On balance, the other provisions of the Code were not breached.</p>	No	N/A
4)	28.02.25	Alleged that the Councillor harassed, bullied, victimised and threatened the complainant via messages and emails; failed to follow the correct processes and constitutional steps required by governance documents.	<p>Decision under Assessment Criteria.</p> <p>Documents disclosed to support allegations did not disclose a breach of the Code, or “sufficiently serious potential breaches of the Code to merit further consideration.”</p> <p>No breach of the code.</p>	No	N/A
5)	26.04.25	Alleged that the Cllr breached confidentiality by disclosing exempt/confidential information in a public meeting.	<p>Decision under Assessment Criteria</p> <p>Did not disclose a breach of the Code, or “sufficiently serious potential breaches of</p>	No	N/A

Summary of Member Code of Conduct (MCC) Complaints, Appendix A

			the Code to merit further consideration.” No breach of the code.		
6)	03.05.25	Alleged that the Councillor failed to respond to communications inviting them to meetings	Decision under Assessment Criteria Did not disclose a breach of the Code, or “sufficiently serious potential breaches of the Code to merit further consideration. No breach of the code.	No	N/A
7)	17.06.25	Alleged threatening and bullying behaviour in respect of neighbour dispute	Decision under Assessment Criteria Breach of the Code, namely – treating others with respect and maintain a high standard of conduct. Required to apologise to the Complainant.	Yes	Unresolved