

NATIONAL 2017 INSURANCE AWARDS WINNER

Specialist Coverage Award



This information and any attachments ("Email") has been sent by NPA under its associated computer system and is confidential. Please notify the sender immediately if you are not the intended recipient. Where it is not the intended recipient, you are not to disseminate, distribute, copy, or act on it.

From: The Reasonable Adjustment <info@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk>
Sent: 25 August 2025 07:30
To: Mark Day <mark.day@verticalpharma.co.uk>
Cc: Legal indemnity Dept. <legal@verticalpharma.co.uk>
Subject: Important: Contradictory Dispatch vs "Waiting Stock" Narrative - Legal Implications and Required Actions (AD/1405212)

Some people who received this message don't often get email from info@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk. [Click here to change settings.](mailto:info@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk)

Caution: This is an external email. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt please contact the IT Department. For more information please see <https://www.verticalpharma.co.uk> and under "Documents" > Policies > Security Awareness

Dear Mr Day,
Further to my earlier correspondence, I need to draw your urgent attention to a material contradiction in your client's account. At 14:22 on 22 August 2025, Carlsberg Clinic informed me that IPS reported they were "awaiting arrival of urgent stock" to fulfil my current prescription and that IPS would not process future prescriptions.

At 21:06 that same evening, Royal Mail confirmed receipt of a Special Delivery parcel from Vertical Pharma Resources Limited for delivery by 13:00 on Saturday 23 August 2025. These two records cannot be reconciled without a credible explanation from IPS. Either stock was available and dispatched early on the evening of 22 August, or IPS's earlier communication about "awaiting urgent stock" was inaccurate or misleading. The timing also follows IPS's decision to cease serving me, notified via Carlsberg rather than to me directly in writing.

It is also notable that dispatch occurred only hours after I had raised in writing that, without action, the delay would amount to 12 days between payment and delivery. This coincidence makes it difficult not to view IPS's representation about stock with suspicion.

This has the following legal implications:

- 1) Equality Act 2010 - victimisation and reasonable adjustment. I have a documented written-only communication adjustment. IPS attempted phone contact instead of written notice, then sent a service-termination message via a third party. In context with the "awaiting stock" statement that same day, the optics suggest a narrative of punitive or retaliatory conduct following protected acts. I intend to present this timeline as evidence in any future proceedings.
- 2) UK GDPR - accuracy, transparency, and SAR non-compliance.

If IPS represented to a clinical partner that stock was not yet available while simultaneously dispatching my medication that evening, this raises questions about record accuracy and transparency. I must also stress that I am still waiting for any form of lawful response to the Subject Access Request I submitted on 24 July 2025. Given that your client asked me basic questions about the SAR's scope only days before the statutory deadline, it is reasonable to assume that I may be waiting a long time if a response comes at all. This reflects very poorly on any organisation, but particularly on a regulated pharmacy.

3) Credibility and litigation risk

Your client's messaging appears inconsistent with the objective dispatch record. This undermines the credibility of prior explanations around cattle, stock status, and delays, and will be relied upon in any regulatory or legal forum. Given the above, please provide by return:

- A written explanation reconciling Carlsberg's "awaiting urgent stock" message at 14:22 with Royal Mail's acceptance scan at 21:06 the same day. Identify who at IPS communicated the stock position to Carlsberg and on what basis.
- The rationale and justification used for terminating service, including why I was not notified directly in writing despite my reasonable adjustment.
- Confirmation that a compensation figure has been held in reserve across IPS's systems covering cattle, CRM costs, call logs, and any internal claim referencing me.
- Clarification of your client's intentions regarding my SAR response, given the statutory deadline has now expired.

For completeness, I am attaching the Carlsberg notification and the Royal Mail dispatch confirmation referenced above. I remain open to constructive resolution. However, this contradiction significantly elevates both legal and reputational exposure for your client. Please treat this as urgent.

Kind regards,

Katrin By Habitus

—
The Reasonable Adjustment
An independent advocacy platform putting confusion for disorganised institutions, over lawful request at a time.
Lived Experience Advocate | Neurodivergence, Disability, Data Rights
info@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk
<https://www.thereasonableadjustment.co.uk>

We offer free peer-led advocacy to neurodivergent, disabled, and marginalised people who've been mistreated or ignored by the systems meant to support them.

—
The Reasonable Adjustment

Advocacy & Representation
info@thereasonableadjustment.co.uk
<https://www.thereasonableadjustment.co.uk>
"Inclusion is a duty - not a marketing slogan."

⚠ Disclaimer: Please do not include sensitive or confidential information in emails. I may respond if appropriate, but such messages will be deleted for data protection and safeguarding reasons.

