

It is my view that Mr Cordell's detention was not in the interests of his health as I did not identify evidence of mental disorder during the visit. I did not believe that Mr Cordell's detention was necessary for his safety, Mr Cordell denied experiencing any suicidal ideation and could I not identify other risks to safety apart from possible substance misuse which could not be used as the basis of detention without clear evidence of a mental disorder associated with the substance misuse issues. I also did not think that the threshold for detention on the basis of safety was met, he was having conflict with neighbour this conflict did not appear to be driven by any mental disorder.

Patient's
name

Simon Cordell

Date of assessment 03.02.16

5. Consultation with Nearest Relative and process of identifying the Nearest Relative

I identified Mr Cordell's Nearest Relative as his mother Lorraine Cordell. Mr Cordell lives alone and is single. As far as I could ascertain he did not have any children and was not in relationship. His father was the older of his parents but when I phoned his mother on 03.02.16 she informed me that he was in regular contact with Mr Cordell and did his shopping for him. I therefore formed the view that she provided care and was the Nearest Relative.

I phoned Lorraine at around 09:30hrs on 09.02.16 and she advised that in her view use of a warrant and the Mental Health Act assessment were unnecessary as he would give professionals access if he had received an appointment letter. She said that he had a court case in February but would not elaborate on this. Lorraine said that she thought that the involvement of mental health services was unnecessary as Mr Cordell was not in her view experiencing any mental health difficulties and had not experienced any mental health difficulties for a number of months.

I was surprised that Lorraine stated that she did not think that Mr Cordell as the recent referral to mental health services had been triggered by a referral that she had made.

6. Consultation with Assessing Doctors

Both assessing Doctors declined to make medical recommendations and were in agreement that there was no clear evidence of any mental disorder during the assessing.

7. Views of others consulted

Prior to the assessment the police present advised me that were aware of conflict between Mr Cordell and his neighbour. They advised that the soundproofing between the two properties was poor. The police officers advised me that they were aware that on one occasion Mr Cordell had threatened to strangle his neighbour.

8. Mental Capacity Act 2005

No Capacity Act issues identified during the assessment.

9. Reason for decision to make the application (including choice of Section)

Given that Mr Cordell's diagnosis and treatment plan were not clear at the time of the assessment the assessment was for possible detention on section 2. It was my view that Mr Cordell did not meet the statutory criteria for detention. It was not clear that he was suffering from a mental disorder of a nature because at the time of the assessment it was unclear if whether or not he had a mental disorder. He did not meet the criteria for degree as there was no clear evidence that he was experiencing symptoms **of mental disorder**.

Patient's name **Simon Cordell**

Date of assessment **03.02.16**

10. If not admitted to hospital, outline immediate plans for alternative to admission and how those plans will be co-ordinated

Early Intervention Team to offer Mr Cordell an appointment with a psychiatrist in there team for a psychiatric assessment.