

Your complaint to Office of the Queensland Ombudsman – [redacted]

Inbox



Mailbox Investigations

to me

Wed, Oct 9, 10:54 AM (1 day ago)

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your recent email received by this Office on 8 October 2019 regarding the decision letter from [redacted]. I will clarify a few points that you raise in your email.

In relation to the Internal Review currently with the Office of the Public Guardian(OPG), the email link that you attached does suggest the OPG had received the request and the matter was referred to the OPG Investigations team in September 2018. This Office will not comment on this internal review process until a decision has been given to you. If you are dissatisfied with the actions or decision reached by the OPG following this internal review, you can return to this Office.

This Office found that the decision by the Office of the Health Ombudsman (OHO) to take no further action was reasonable. Our Office looks into the maladministration of State Agencies/Authorities and our assessment of your complaint into the OHO revealed they had given fair and reasonable reasons in making their decision. I appreciate it was not the outcome you were seeking, however, the information you have provided in your email dated 8 October 2019 does not provide any new information. Therefore, in light of this, the decision of 4 October 2019 remains the same.

If you remain unhappy with this Office's decision you are entitled to request an internal review.

Internal reviews are undertaken by another officer, of equal or greater seniority to the original decision-maker, who was not involved in the handling of your complaint. The reviewing officer will determine whether the original decision-maker made the correct and preferable decision. The reviewing officer may decide to confirm the decision or set it aside and make another decision, such as referring the matter for further investigation. The review may also identify ways to improve this Office's practices.

To request an internal review, please provide a short, written submission to the Office detailing:

- why you consider the decision about your complaint to be wrong
- any relevant new evidence
- the outcome you are seeking from your complaint to this Office.

When requesting an internal review, you do not need to repeat any information already provided to this Office; however, you do need to explain why you consider the decision to be wrong. Simply disagreeing with the decision, or restating your original complaint to this Office, will not be a sufficient basis for an internal review. If you do not provide sufficient grounds, the internal review request will be declined and you will be notified of this in writing.

Please note also that a request for an internal review must be made no later than three months after the original decision. If your request is made more than three months after the original decision, you must detail any exceptional circumstances which contributed to the delay in making the request.

For more information, please see this Office's Internal review [policy](#) and [procedure](#).

If you need further clarification on this matter, please contact me to discuss

Kind regards

[redacted]

-
This email is to be read subject to the disclaimer below:

The information contained in this email, and any attachments, (the email) is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain information which is confidential or privileged or in which copyright is held. If you have received the email in error, you are asked to inform the sender as quickly as possible and delete the email and any copies thereof from your computer system network. In any event, any form of disclosure, modification, distribution and/or publication of the email is prohibited.

Any views expressed in the email are those of the sender only.

Except as required by law, the Queensland Ombudsman and the Office does not represent, warrant and/or guarantee that the integrity of this email has been maintained nor that the email is free of errors, virus, interception or interference.

Email correspondence sent to the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman may be treated as a public record and retained as required by the Public Records Act 2002 and other relevant legislation. Personal information contained in emails sent to this Office may be used and disclosed by the Office in accordance with the discharge of its functions under the Ombudsman Act 2001 or otherwise as required or authorised by law. Email messages may be monitored by our information technology staff for trouble-shooting, maintenance and appropriate usage.



[redacted]
to Mailbox

Wed, Oct 9, 11:38 AM (23 hours ago)

Hello [redacted],

I have read your response and have considered your wording regarding my previous email, as mentioned to you when you phoned me last week and informed me you gave favor to the OHO regarding your decision based on medical grounds of a inconclusive nature said dementia.

I remarked I would be seeking the RTI and we both know that with a EPOA it will be difficult, you have show that you have colluded with the OHO as [redacted] did when he remarked that the OPG probably just made a mistake and granted them another 6 weeks to formally respond to me. You still have not admitted that conversation took place when [redacted] spoke to me by phone and suggested that the OPG had told him that they did not receive a request for review and this is why I provided the proof of a signatory.

Your office has shown a bias based around the EPOA and staff has used it's power to stone wall me to protect the perpetrators of these concerns of abuse and the individuals that are set out by Government to investigate allegations of abuse.

I do not need to waist my time in contacting another individual in your office to be played upon in a effort to ware me down. We all know that the Royal Commission has established that the EPOA Act is to protect the EPOA against litigation when abuse occurs, it is not to protect or stonewall investigation into abuse.

I do appreciate your correspondence as it shows clearly the failings of the systems set out to protect vulnerable Australians as poorly misinterpreted not lacking, it is just a case of punishment fit for the crime of failing to act that needs to be implemented. Family's have requested that persons are held accountable through new amendments for example jail time for failing to act or investigate forms of abuse such as my Uncle endured like a POW in the worst of POW camps, a complete disgrace.

Kind regards [redacted] 9/10/2019



ReplyForward