

From: Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>
Sent: 13 July 2018 14:48
To: complaintsandinformation
Subject: Re: Simon Cordell - assessment complaint [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Dear Daniel

Thank you for the reply, i believe what you have been told is misleading, as the council are very aware everything is recorded our side.

I also notice you have only covered one issue that was spoke about when you called me after my brother called you, but i had a feeling that would happen.

I do understand that things are complexed as Enfield Council has only ever gone one sided and never heard or wanted to hear anything we had to say, this was clearly shown in the call when you stated we have not been able to talk to anyone regarding issues, but that is the way that Enfield Council wanted it they just wanted to believe what they wanted, but only hearing one side to everything is not correct as there is two sides to everything.

Regards

Lorraine Cordell

Sent from my iPhone

> On 11 Jul 2018, at 14:25, complaintsandinformation <complaintsandinformation@enfield.gov.uk> wrote:
>
> Classification: OFFICIAL
> Dear Lorraine,
>
> I am writing further to our recent telephone conversation about your sons mental health assessment.
>
> I have been provided with the following comments from the team handling the case:
>
> On 30th May 2018, the Court ordered the Claimant (Enfield Council) to appoint a consultant psychiatrist to assess whether Mr Cordell has capacity to litigate. Before we arranged the appointment with the consultant psychiatrist,, we sought approval from Mr Cordell's solicitors who were provided with the consultant's details and CV. The consultant was an independent consultant. The court does not appoint assessors. The solicitors did not oppose the proposed appointment and their consent was sought at all times, we also agreed the appointment with them including dates and times.
>
> I can confirm that two council officers attended Mr Cordell's flat with the Consultant Psychiatrist at 9.30am on Friday 6th July 2018 and waited while the consultant assessed Mr Cordell. It was necessary to send the officers to ensure that the consultant was not at risk. Previously, on 3 July 2018, a previous consultant had met with Mr Cordell on her own to carry out an assessment but did not feel safe and had to leave without completing the assessment. The council officers were not part of the assessment and only attended the appointment to ensure that the consultant was not at risk.
>
> I do understand from our conversation that you intend to pursue this matter further via solicitors.
>
> Kind regards,
>
> Daniel Ellis
> Statutory Complaints Officer
> Complaints & Access to Information Team London Borough of Enfield
>