

**WEST MIDLANDS FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY**

**Standards Committee**

**31<sup>st</sup> March 2008**

1. **CASE SUMMARIES**

Report of the Monitoring Officer.

RECOMMENDED

THAT members note the contents of the report and the case summaries and consider any issues for the local authority.

2. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report is submitted to inform members of recent notable cases publicised by the Standards Board or the Adjudication Panel as these may add to the learning at the local level.

3. **BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 From Spring 2008 the Standards Committee will have responsibility for much of the casework relating to the ethical standards framework.
- 3.2 As well as complying with legislation and guidance the Standards Committee will need to demonstrate learning from issues arising from local investigations and determinations. Further it would be advisable for Standards Committee to be kept informed of any particularly notable cases that are publicised by the Standards Board or the Adjudication Panel as they may also add to learning at the local level. Similarly it is important to note the type of cases where either there is found to be no breach or where it is determined that no action should be taken as well as cases where sanctions are imposed.
- 3.3 The case summary at Appendix 1 concerns a councillor from Birmingham City Council who faced various allegations. It was decided that no action needed to be taken.

- 3.4 The case summary at Appendix 2 concerns a councillor from the London Borough of Redbridge who it was alleged had failed to treat others with respect and had brought his office into disrepute. It was decided that no action needed to be taken.
- 3.5 The case summary at Appendix 3 concerns a councillor from Corby Borough Council. It was alleged that the member failed to disclose a personal interest and failed to withdraw from a meeting in which they had a prejudicial interest. It was decided that no action needed to be taken.
- 3.6 The case summary at Appendix 4 concerns a councillor from Tamworth Borough Council who it was alleged had failed to treat others with respect and had brought their office or authority into disrepute. It was decided that no action needed to be taken.
- 3.7 The case summary at Appendix 5 concerns a councillor from Somerset County Council who it was alleged had improperly secured an advantage or disadvantage. It was found that there was no evidence that he had breached the Code of Conduct.

#### 4. **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

In preparing this report an initial Equality Impact Assessment is not required and has not been carried out.

#### 5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

By considering national cases of significance the Standards Committee will be better informed and placed to discharge duties in relation to local assessments, reviews, referrals, investigations and determinations.

#### 6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

### **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Case Summaries and Press Releases – Standards Board for England.

N SHARMA  
MONITORING OFFICER