

## SPSO decision report



**Case:** 201909385, Glasgow City Health and Social Care Partnership  
**Sector:** Health and Social Care  
**Subject:** Clinical treatment / Diagnosis  
**Decision:** not upheld, no recommendations

### Summary

C submitted a complaint on behalf of their sibling (A). A was treated by the partnership over a period of approximately 18 months under two separate admissions to hospital. C complained about the treatment provided during that time through a number of complaint submissions.

We took independent advice from an appropriately qualified adviser about the complaints.

C complained that the partnership failed to provide reasonable treatment to A. We found that the medication prescribed for A was reasonable, adhered to relevant guidance and was reasonably monitored to ensure treatment benefits were balanced with possible side effects. Therefore, we did not uphold this complaint.

C complained that the partnership failed to provide reasonable care to A. We found that while there was a failing in terms of A's contact with their child, overall the care provided to A by the partnership was reasonable. Therefore, we did not uphold this complaint.

C complained that the partnership failed to use a reasonable level of restraint on A. We found that the use of physical restraint was appropriate and reasonable, was used in accordance with partnership's policies and in accordance with legislation. The adviser considered physical restraint was utilised for the minimum period of time necessary and there were no prolonged periods of restraint. As such, we did not uphold this complaint.

C complained that the partnership unreasonably discharged A after their first admission. We found that the actions taken prior to A's first discharge were reasonable, with the discharge itself well planned and reasonable. They were of the view that risks were identified and the rationale given for discharge balanced the risks with the benefits to A. We considered that the actions taken to mitigate those risks were reasonable. As such, we did not uphold the complaint.

C complained that the partnership unreasonably discharged A after their second admission. We found the partnership's rationale behind discharging was reasonable. We found that communication prior to discharge was also reasonable. Risks were mitigated through supports put in place in the community and A's clinical presentation and the decision to discharge was appropriate, reasonable and made with A's best interest in mind. As such, we did not uphold the complaint.

C complained that the partnership failed to reasonably communicate with A's named carer while A was under the partnership's care. We found, based on the records available, that there was evidence of involvement by A's family and their named carer into the management, treatment, progress and discharge. We considered the medical record evidenced reasonable, regular communication with A's named carer and their wider family, which was in line with expected practice. Therefore, we did not uphold the complaint.