



oppressed neurodivergent &lt;neurodivergentoppressed@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Formal Escalation, Inappropriate Handling of Complaint Intended for Trustees

---

oppressed neurodivergent &lt;neurodivergentoppressed@gmail.com&gt;

14 July 2025 at 05:03

To: "beverley.brooks@therecruitmentjunction.com" <beverley.brooks@therecruitmentjunction.com>,  
info@therecruitmentjunction.com

Cc: kate.osborne.casework@parliament.uk, NEPS.generalenquiries@justice.gov.uk

Bcc: ASCPadmin@newcastle.gov.uk, safeguarding.adults@southtyneside.gov.uk

Dear Ms Brooks, I'm sending this early to ensure receipt, as I've previously experienced issues with blocked correspondence.

**Please treat the following message as formally addressed to the Board of Trustees of The Recruitment Junction. As it concerns your own conduct and decisions made under your leadership, I must respectfully insist that it be passed to the trustees without delay. Note that this is a follow-up from my previous email which I insist the trustees also receive.**

Dear Trustees,

***Please note that this correspondence is being submitted via Ms Beverley Brooks, solely for the purpose of relaying this communication to you. As it concerns her own conduct and decisions made under her leadership, I must respectfully insist that it be treated as a matter for independent trustee review.***

I am writing in reference to my formal complaint submitted on **9 July 2025**, which was explicitly addressed to the Board of Trustees of The Recruitment Junction. The letter detailed serious concerns relating to the organisation's conduct, compliance with its charitable objectives, and treatment of disabled service users referred via the Probation Service.

**It has now come to my attention that Ms Beverley Brooks, as CEO, issued a direct response to this complaint on behalf of the charity. I must formally express concern that this action constitutes a procedural failure and may amount to an inappropriate conflict of interest, given that the complaint relates in part to her personal conduct and decisions made under her leadership.**

The purpose of escalating the matter to the trustees was to ensure that it would be reviewed **independently and without undue influence**, in accordance with standards of good governance, accountability, and safeguarding – particularly given the serious nature of the concerns raised.

As I understand it, trustees have a **legal responsibility** to oversee the performance and accountability of the charity, including the conduct of senior leadership. A response from the individual subject to the complaint **cannot be reasonably considered a substitute for proper trustee oversight**.

I must also raise a significant procedural concern: **Ms Brooks failed to address or acknowledge the core issues detailed in my original letter**. These included, but were not limited to:

- Why my original CV, which had already generated employer interest, was rejected as unsuitable.
- Why I was told I would not be put forward for opportunities unless I accepted the generic CV, effectively penalising me for asserting my right to self-representation.
- How TRJ's approach aligns with its stated charitable objectives and Christian ethos.
- The rationale behind notifying my probation officer and blocking further communication.
- What safeguarding or review mechanisms were considered before support was withdrawn.
- What measures are in place to protect future neurodivergent clients from similar treatment.

**None of these concerns were substantively answered** in her response. This failure further reinforces the need for the trustees to take direct ownership of the matter.

**In fact, the tone of Ms Brooks' response was notably dismissive and, at times, condescending. For example, she stated that I was "made aware of the complaints procedure upon enrolment" and that it is "displayed in our office," as though this fact absolves the organisation of its responsibility to follow**

**proper process. I am fully aware of the complaints procedure, and in fact followed it to the letter by directing my written complaint to the trustees when it concerned the CEO herself. Her failure to respect this procedure reflects poorly on her understanding of organisational accountability and suggests an unwillingness to submit to the very scrutiny she promotes.**

Equally troubling was her statement: *"I believe work is a genuine prospect for you."* If that is truly the case, then I am at a loss to understand why she chose to withdraw all support at the precise moment I demonstrated autonomy, self-advocacy, and lawful concern about how my data and identity were being used. Her actions completely contradict her stated belief and undermine the charity's claimed mission of second chances and compassion. Disappointingly, the evidence insofar would reflect this to be a reoccurring theme.

I am therefore formally requesting the following:

- **Confirmation that the Board of Trustees has received my original letter of complaint.**
- **Clarification on why the response was issued by the CEO rather than through a trustee-led process.**
- **A commitment that the Board of Trustees will now review this matter independently and respond directly within 14 calendar days.**

In addition to the above, I wish to highlight several **governance, legal, and safeguarding concerns** arising from the current handling of this matter:

## **1. Breach of Charity Governance Principles**

The *Charity Governance Code* and *Charities Act 2011* require independent oversight and fair complaint procedures. Permitting the CEO to respond to a complaint about her own conduct risks undermining both the substance and appearance of impartiality.

## **2. Legal Conflict of Interest**

This situation creates both a **perceived and actual conflict of interest**, potentially exposing the charity to regulatory scrutiny and legal challenge.

## **3. Erosion of Public Trust**

The failure to demonstrate clear, independent accountability may compromise **public confidence, donor trust**, and the charity's relationships with **commissioners and funders**.

## **4. Disregard for the Equality Act 2010**

The response from Ms Brooks showed no indication that the charity acknowledges its **proactive duty** to make reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act. There was no sign of reflection, remediation, or learning regarding the discriminatory impact of abruptly withdrawing support from a disabled individual.

## **5. Lack of Safeguarding Consideration**

The *Charity Commission's safeguarding guidance* makes clear that trustees must ensure the charity does not cause harm to individuals in contact with it. The handling of this matter – including the punitive withdrawal of support, absence of review, and blocking of communication – raises significant safeguarding red flags.

## **6. Impact Beyond This Case**

The issues raised here reflect broader systemic risks. If left unaddressed, they may result in harm or exclusion to **other neurodivergent or vulnerable service users**, particularly those referred via criminal justice pathways.

## **7. Preparedness to Escalate**

While I continue to act in good faith, please be aware that I am prepared to escalate this matter to the **Charity Commission, Information Commissioner's Office (ICO)**, relevant **public funders, employment partners**, and **if necessary - the media**, should appropriate governance procedures not be followed.

For transparency, I have copied this message to **my Probation Officer** and the office of **Kate Osborne MP**, both of whom are aware of and monitoring this matter.

**Please confirm receipt and advise how the Board of Trustees intends to proceed. I remain open to resolution but expect future responses to reflect the level of governance required.**

I trust the trustees will recognise that what began as a respectful request for autonomy has now exposed a deeper failure of leadership, governance, and accountability - and that **silence or deflection at this stage would speak louder than any response.**

I have immense respect for all the work the team at The Recruitment Junction do for an otherwise forgotten about cohort of society - your work changes and saves lives. Though regardless of how much I value your importance to our region, the way this situation has been handled is simply wrong and makes me feel like I have been treated with disregard, contempt, and unwarranted levels of disrespect as a disabled service user. I am advocating for other vulnerable people, specifically those who may lack the ability, determination, or desire to stand up for what's right, not for my own personal gain. These are values I would like to think we both share.

