

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
ADJUDICATION AND REVIEW COMMITTEE
Committee Room 4 - Town Hall
15 March 2016 (6.00 - 6.10 pm)**

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Conservative Group Garry Pain (Chairman) and Roger Westwood

**East Havering
Residents' Group** Alex Donald

All decisions were taken with no votes against.

The Chairman reminded Members of the action to be taken in an emergency.

1 CODE OF CONDUCT

The Sub-Committee noted the Code of Conduct which had been circulated for their information.

2 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Committee resolved to exclude the public from the meeting during discussion of the following item on the grounds that if members of the public were present it was likely that, given the nature of the business to be transacted, that there would be disclosure to them of exempt information within the meaning of paragraph 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 which could reveal information relating to an individual and it was not in the public interest to publish this information.

3 CONSIDERATION OF A COMPLAINT AGAINST A MEMBER MADE BY A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

Following a meeting of the Individuals Overview & Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on 27 January 2015 a member of the public had submitted a complaint alleging:

1. That Councillor X had disclosed information they had provided to a third party, without their permission, which had then been used by the third party to submit a business case;

2. That Councillor X had a conflict of interest between their role as a trustee of the third party and their role on the Sub-Committee.

The Monitoring Officer had advised that the matter be not investigated as, on balance, he did not see any significant benefit from an investigation.

The Sub-Committee had been advised that the Independent Person had concurred with this advice.

The Sub-Committee agreed that the complaint merited no further investigation and should be dismissed.

4 CONSIDERATION OF THREE COMPLAINTS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS AGAINST OTHER MEMBERS.

The Monitoring Officer reported that he had received three complaints involving Councillor Y. These were:

1. A complaint by Councillor Z against Councillor Y;
2. A complaint by Councillor Y against Councillor Z; and
3. A complaint by Councillor W against Councillor Y.

The Monitoring Officer informed the Sub-Committee that since he had received the complaints Councillor Y had resigned as a Councillor.

Both Councillor Z and Councillor Y had accused the other of calling them a liar. Councillor Y had admitted he had called Councillor Z a liar but had refused to apologise.

The third complaint by Councillor W concerned an incident which had taken place in Council officers in front of witnesses.

Initially the Monitoring Officer had advised that given the factual inter relationship between Councillors Z and Y either both complaints or neither complaint should be referred for further investigation. The third complaint might merit further investigation.

The Independent Person had indicated his agreement with the conclusion drawn by the Monitoring Officer.

In the light of the changed circumstances the Monitoring Officer now advised that he could see no merit in further investigation of any of the three complaints.

The Sub-Committee agreed:

1. The complaint by Councillor Z against Councillor Y merited no further investigation and should be dismissed;

Adjudication and Review Committee, 15
March 2016

2. The complaint by Councillor Y against Councillor Z merited no further investigation and should be dismissed; and
3. The complaint by Councillor W against Councillor Y merited no further investigation and should be dismissed.

Chairman