AI-Assisted Evidential Timeline: Funeral Attendance Decision & Subsequent Internal Narrative (April 2020)
Concise evidential summary for brief reading

25 March 2020
My mother passed away. No meaningful contact was made by Herefordshire Council regarding funeral arrangements or my brother's attendance in the immediate period following her death.

11 April 2020 (19:32)
I sent a detailed email to the Priory Group and associated parties regarding:
• funeral arrangements
• my brother's attendance
• ongoing communication failures (including lack of Skype contact)
This demonstrates that relevant communication and engagement attempts were made by me prior to the funeral.

13 April 2020
Herefordshire Council's own internal record later confirms that Adult Social Care had received a copy of my 11 April email by Monday 13 April:
"On Monday 13th ASC received a copy of an email…"
Despite this documented knowledge, no meaningful consultation or engagement occurred with me regarding funeral arrangements or any best interests decision.

14 April 2020 (Day of Funeral)
• Brief voicemail messages were left by CA from Adult Social Care.
• One message explicitly referred to my brother's attendance at the funeral.
• These messages were left on a landline not in use and a mobile device.
• The messages were not heard by me until after the funeral had already taken place.
• No letter or email was sent to me by Herefordshire Council regarding my mother's death, funeral arrangements, or my brother's attendance.

On the same day, at 15:13, a Priory Group manager emailed to state that, following discussions with social care, my brother would not be permitted to attend our mother's funeral.

Post-Event Internal Record (Date unspecified)
A council record states that:
• a best interest decision was recorded as having been made, without any documented consultation with me as an interested party
• attempts were made to speak to me
• the risk of attendance was considered too high

2
This is difficult to reconcile with the available evidence, given that the documented contact attempts consisted only of brief voicemail requests left on the day of the funeral, after the Council had already received my 11 April email and after no prior meaningful consultation had occurred.

24 April 2020 – Internal Council Email (RC)
An internal email circulated to council staff states:
• the matter appears "one sided"
• there is "no evidence of letters, emails etc." sent to either the Council or Priory Group
This statement appears to have been made in response to my social media posts. However, it is difficult to reconcile with both the documented existence of my 11 April email and the council's own record confirming Adult Social Care had received a copy by 13 April.

Summary of Evidential Issues
• Documented communication by me existed prior to the funeral
• Herefordshire Council had documented knowledge of that communication before the funeral
• No meaningful consultation or engagement occurred before the decision
• Recorded contact attempts occurred only on the day of the funeral, after prior documented communication had already been received by the Council
• Internal communications reflect a dismissive assessment difficult to reconcile with the documented evidence
• No written communication was sent to me by Herefordshire Council regarding my mother's death, funeral arrangements, or my brother's attendance

Resulting Concerns
• Failure to consult or engage in accordance with the Mental Capacity Act 2005
• Potential retrospective or inaccurate record-keeping
• Formation and circulation of an internal narrative inconsistent with known facts
• Possible impact on decisions affecting my brother's rights and welfare

Pattern of Narrative Formation and Dismissal of Evidence
The internal email of 24 April 2020 is significant not only for its content, but for what it reveals about the approach taken by council officers.
3
Despite the documented existence of prior communication, including my email of 11 April 2020, and the council's own record confirming Adult Social Care had received a copy by 13 April, the matter was internally characterised as "one sided" with "no evidence of letters, emails etc.". This appears to reflect a position formed without proper consideration of

the available material.
This is consistent with a broader pattern observed in subsequent interactions, whereby:
• evidence submitted by me was not properly acknowledged or incorporated into records;
• concerns were dismissed without transparent evidential assessment; and
• my engagement was later characterised using terms such as "vexatious", despite being supported by documented communications.
The effect of this approach is not merely procedural. It creates a narrative framework in which legitimate concerns are minimised or disregarded, and where decisions affecting the rights and welfare of vulnerable individuals are made without full and fair consideration of relevant evidence.
In this context, the 24 April 2020 communication represents an early example of an internal narrative being formed and circulated which did not accurately reflect the evidential position, and which appears to have influenced the subsequent handling of my concerns.