Consultation Response

Tribunal Procedure Committee proposal to amend the Tribunal Procedure (First-Tier Tribunal) (Health, Education and Social Care Chamber) Rules 2008

14 June 2018

Reference No. 2418

All rights reserved. Third parties may only reproduce this paper or parts of it for academic, educational or research purposes or where the prior consent of Age UK has been obtained for influencing or developing policy and practice.

Emily.McCarron@ageuk.org.uk

Age UK Tavis House 1-6 Tavistock Square London WC1H 9NA T 0800 169 80 80 F 020 3033 1000 E policy@ageuk.org.uk www.ageuk.org.uk

Age UK is a charitable company limited by guarantee and registered in England (registered charity number 1128267 and registered company number 6825798). The registered address is Tavis House 1-6 Tavistock Square, London WC1H 9NA.

About this consultation

1. Introduction

Age UK is a national charity that works with a network of partners, including Age Scotland, Age Cymru, Age NI and local Age UKs across England, to help everyone make the most of later life, whatever their circumstances.

In the UK, the Charity helps more than seven million older people each year by providing advice and support. It also researches and campaigns on the issues that matter most to older people. Its work focuses on ensuring that older people: have enough money; enjoy life and feel well; receive high quality health and care; are comfortable, safe and secure at home; and feel valued and able to participate.

A January 2018 Care Quality Commission report¹ shows that there has been a 36% rise in the number of detentions under the Mental Health Act (MHA) since 2010. This rise has been a result of a number of factors (increased police awareness of mental health issues, overrepresentation of BME groups) but has also in part been due to the increase in the number of older people being detained under the MHA. Because of delays in getting an assessor visit under Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS), staff are increasingly using the MHA for authorisation of care.

We are very concerned that these proposals will have a particular impact on older people $\tilde{a}_{a} \otimes \tilde{a}_{a} \otimes \tilde{a} \otimes \tilde{a}_{a} \otimes \tilde{a} \otimes \tilde{a}_{a} \otimes \tilde{a} \otimes \tilde{$

2. Proposal 1: Removing the right to a pre-hearing psychiatric evaluation

The PHE provides an up-to-a^{*}æ[•] $ae • • • \{ ^ c c c e \} c [~ c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a c e a$

We are concerned that Proposal 2 will result in a system in which people who lack capacity, and who are therefore unable to request a hearing, will have their detention too easily renewed.

An oral hearing allows for far greater safeguards for the rights and needs of a service user than does a paper hearing, since clinicians must explain the course of treatment and their clinical assessment, and expect to be cross-examined by the tribunal. It also allows an opportunity for advocates to make a case based on the best interests of a service user. The rules already allow for a paper hearing where the service user has requested one.

Mental health tribunals make decisa $\mathbf{\hat{a}} \mathbf{\hat{c}} \mathbf{\hat{c}}$

Age UK is very concerned that allowing tribunals to take decisions without an oral hearing will have a profound impact on those most vulnerable members of our community, particularly older people, resulting in their indefinite detention.

We urge the Government to wait until the Independent Review of the Mental Health Act to deliver its final report (and recommendations) later this year before pursuing any significant changes to tribunal procedure.