

From: **Conor Chapple** sparkelectrical.sw@gmail.com 

Subject: Notice of Publication – UKAS Complaint Handling, DBT, HSE Involvement, and Misuse of Independent Review by Named Subject.

Date: 27 March 2025 at 03:10

To: Department for Business and Trade dbtcorrespondence@businessandtrade.gov.uk, Enquiries Opss OPSS.enquiries@businessandtrade.gov.uk, DBT Complaints complaints@businessandtrade.gov.uk, BSRCorrespondence BSRCorrespondence@hse.gov.uk, HSE Complaints hsecomplaints@hse.gov.uk, Fred Thomas MP fred.thomas.mp@parliament.uk, Competition and Markets Justin Madders MP Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Employment Rights madders.correspondence@businessandtrade.gov.uk

CC

Dear Department for Business and Trade, OPSS, HSE, Building Safety Regulator, and Parliamentary Representatives,

I am writing to formally notify you that I will be publishing a comprehensive record of the mishandling of my complaint regarding NAPIT and UKAS, including the involvement of DBT, OPSS, HSE, BSR, and named officials. This will include all supporting evidence: Subject Access Request (SAR) disclosures, Freedom of Information disclosures, internal correspondence, official records, and direct quotes.

Closure of Complaint and Legal Action

- DBT closed my complaint on **30 October 2024**, forcing me to pursue legal action the same day.
- UKAS **defaulted** on that legal claim concerning the **fraudulent review** DBT and others relied upon.
- The review—authored by **Jackie Burton**—was challenged, uncontested and then settled in **January 2025**.

Internal Admissions by DBT

- DBT's internal correspondence includes this conclusion:

"We all agreed we cannot comment on complaints about UKAS"

"I have spoken to all teams involved and have highlighted to them that we cannot class this individual as vexatious or burdensome"

- This followed internal discussions labelling me "**vexatious**" across several DBT personnel **without informing me** or offering any right of reply.

Conflict in the "Independent Review"

- The review in question was authored by **Jackie Burton**—the individual I complained about for withholding evidence.
- SAR disclosures confirm this:

"He did make a complaint about me being involved in the management of his complaint."

- An internal message later added:

"Can I leave it to you to respond to [redacted] — I think she's been assigned to the case."— confirming Burton's continued involvement despite the conflict.

BSR's Parallel Handling

- The **Building Safety Regulator**, like DBT, dealt directly with Jackie Burton.
- Her name was redacted, but her **job title remained visible**.
- She submitted:
 - A **closing email to me—from her—dated 22 July**, and
 - The same **review—again, authored by Jackie Burton—dated 9 August**, which includes the statement:

"You raised concern that all evidence wasn't disclosed by my colleague Jackie Burton..."

Pattern of Compromised Processes

- In another related case, **Sean Halligan** assigned himself to the Tier 1 escalation process, he then **reviewed his own conduct**— reinforcing a **pattern of internal self-review** and lack of independence.

Publication Notice - <https://whistleblowertrickery.icu> (work in progress)

I will be publishing all names, quotes, emails, and documents as received — unaltered — on my public

archive website.

This is not speculation. It is a factual, traceable record backed by formal disclosures.

If any party wishes to challenge the publication of specific details, I will only consider **substantiated objections**.

Requested Clarification

If you continue to stand by the independence of the review conducted, please:

1. Provide evidence that Jackie Burton was not the investigation officer in either review and also the names of the relevant investigation officers that were involved.
 2. Specify:
 - o What my original complaint to UKAS was about;
 - o What my follow-up complaint was about;
 - o What explanation of events Jackie Burton provided that was taken at face value.
-

I trust this will be treated as a formal request for transparency and accountability.

Sincerely,

Conor

	Jackie Burton (see note below)
	01.11.17
ation (for completion by the UKAS Quality Team only)	
d	Jackie Burton 01.11.17
	NB the whistle blower did not request his concerns were treated as a complaint but for completeness and given the seriousness of this case a feedback record has been created and this report produced

