



## Balancing act

### Scenario B2: What are the issues?

The complaints against Councillor Bear and Councillor Eagle at the unitary authority, have both been considered. The complaint against Councillor Bear has been passed for investigation; the complaint against Councillor Eagle has not, although it has been suggested by the standards committee as their determination that he should perhaps apologise at least for being perhaps perceptive and unwise and not seeking advice before disclosing the information that they now consider was not in breach of the Code of Conduct as Councillor Bear had put it in the public domain. Councillor Eagle has refused to apologise on the basis that he does not believe there is any breach of the Code of Conduct and will not apologise for something he considers is not wrong, a breach or inappropriate. Councillor Bear is aggrieved because she believes that Councillor Eagle's breach was equally as serious as hers and if she is to be investigated (and she is currently simply denying everything), she believes he should be as well. A number of members have also approached the monitoring officer at the unitary authority because the district council, where Councillor Bear's husband disclosed the confidential information in the public debate, has not made a complaint against her husband and they feel the monitoring officer should do so as a matter of some urgency, otherwise they see a lack of consistency. They consider that the district council is at fault for failing to take Councillor Bear's husband to task and ask the unitary authority monitoring officer whether a complaint can or should be made by the monitoring officer against the leader, mayor or any members of the district council (they are particularly keen to pursue Councillor Animal and would like the monitoring officer to pursue him in particular) in relation to this.

### What are the outcomes, possible sanctions and/or issues?