Contents

Summary

The allegation I investigated was that the Member had misused the crowned portcullis, a royal badge, by sending out party-political literature on paper bearing that badge. The Member assured me that the mailshot had been sent at no cost to the public purse and, after I had drawn her attention to the relevant rules and shared with her the advice I had obtained from the House authorities, she acknowledged the misuse of the crowned portcullis, which put her in breach of paragraph 15 of the Code of Conduct for Members and apologised. She assured me that she now had a better understanding of the relevant rules.

I considered that to be an appropriate outcome to a relatively minor and inadvertent breach of the rules, and I concluded the matter using the rectification procedure available under House of Commons' Standing Order No 150.

Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP: Resolution letter

Letter from the Commissioner to Mr Simon Jennings, 16 May 2018

I wrote to you on 15 March 2018 to say that I would begin an inquiry into your allegation that Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP had acted in breach of paragraph 15 of the Code of Conduct for Members.

I am pleased to be able to tell you that I have now completed my inquiry. I have been in correspondence with Dr Allin-Khan and she has acknowledged a breach of the rules, for which she has apologised.

The correspondence I have exchanged with Dr Allin-Khan is reproduced in full in the evidence pack, a copy of which is attached. (This will be posted in my webpages in due course.) Item 11 - my letter of 11 April 2018 to Dr Allin-Khan - sets out the reasons for my decision.

I have concluded this inquiry using the rectification procedure. I consider Dr Allin-Khan's acknowledgement of the breach and her apology to be an appropriate outcome.

16 May 2018

Written evidence

1. Letter from Mr Simon Jennings to the Commissioner, 28 February 2018

I would like to raise a formal complaint against my own MP, Dr Rosena Allin-Khan, regarding a recent mailshot that was delivered to houses in Earlsfield (SW18). Please find attached a copy of this letter. This letter can only be defined as entirely party political in its nature, and is in no way related to her work as a Member of Parliament.

Page 5 of the Members Handbook states that "*the House provides various facilities and services to Members, the cost of which is either met in full or subsidised by public funds. These include, for example:*

- *accommodation, including office and meeting rooms*
- *research support*
- *ICT equipment services*
- *catering facilities*
- *stationery*

These facilities and services are provided in order to assist Members in their parliamentary work. They should be used appropriately, in such a way as to ensure that the reputation of the House is not put at risk. They should not be used for party political campaigning or private business activity." Page 8 of the Members Handbook continues, stating that "*Members shall at all times ensure that their use of expenses, allowances, facilities and services provided from the public purse is strictly in accordance with the rules laid down on these matters*".

I would like to raise a number of reasons why I believe this letter contravenes the rules of the House.

(1) Stationery - although conjecture, it is a fair assumption to assume that the paper used is parliamentary paper. A quick look on her website shows that exactly the same paper is used in her work as an MP (http://www.drrosena.co.uk/plastic-straws-pledge.html). This suggests that the enclosed letter and the paper used could have been paid for out of the public purse. I believe serious questions should be asked.

(2) ICT equipment & accommodation - in the letter Ms Allin-Khan provided three ways of getting in touch with "the Labour team": email, letter and telephone. The address given is her Westminster address, which is

obviously paid for out of the public purse. The same applies to the telephone number given - which is registered to her constituency office. A quick look on the IPSA website shows that this is paid for by the public. Another quick look on IPSA shows that she employs a number of staff. All letters and telephone calls would consequently be handled by these staff. I would understand if she said in the letter to get in touch with herself in her capacity as the MP for Earlsfield, to raise local constituency matters. However, the phrase "in touch with us (...) your Labour team" suggests her constituency office is working with the local Earlsfield Labour team, to further the Labour Party. Furthermore, the email address she has provided is the same email address she suggests constituents use to contact her regarding her work as an MP. We all know that MPs' staff act as gatekeepers to these accounts and filter these emails. Again, this suggests that parliamentary staff are working on a local election using parliamentary paid for ICT Equipment and accommodation to further Labour's position in Earlsfield.

Lastly, I believe that the use of the Portcullis symbol is unwarranted as it ignores the authority of the House. The symbol is used on two separate occasions and in a very prominent position on the front page. According to the Parliament's Official Website (http://www.parliament.uk/site-information/glossary/portcullis/) "The portcullis symbol is used to identify official parliamentary publications and correspondence from MPs and members of the House of Lords." It is quite clear that as this is not an 'official parliamentary publication' and should in theory not constituent parliamentary correspondence. Again, I believe this breaks the rules of the House.

28 February 2018

Enclosure 1: text of the letter from Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP

Introducing your Earlsfield local Labour team

In May, you will have the opportunity to elect three new councillors to represent our community at the Town Hall.

Good local councillors can make a real difference to local people's lives. I am happy to introduce [names redacted], your local Labour team, who I know will be real champions for Earlsfield, and will work with me to make a real difference in our community.

- [name redacted] is a former senior manager in the civil service specialising in health, and has lived locally for over 20 years. He has a wealth of experience working with central and local government so he really knows how to get things done.

- [name redacted] is a secondary school teacher, an active trade unionist, and has been involved in campaigns to protect education funding since 2010. He lives in Earlsfield with his wife in privately rented

accommodation. [redacted] knows the challenges faced by renters and is committed to making housing a top priority.

- [name redacted] works in marketing and is active in the PTA at the school her children attend. She has been working with local teachers and parents leading the fight against the cuts to schools like Earlsfield Primary and Beatrix Potter School.

[names redacted] are all committed to keeping the same low Council Tax - after all, they pay it just like the rest of us.

In May, you will have the chance to vote for local Labour candidates who will put all the local residents first, whatever their politics, to work with the community to make our roads safer and greener for pedestrians and cyclists, fight the negative impacts of Brexit and defend local schools from cuts.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch with us if you think your Labour team can help you with anything at all. We are committed to working hard for everyone in Earlsfield.

2. Letter from the Commissioner to Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP, 5 March 2018

I would be grateful for your help with an allegation I received from Mr Simon Jennings on 2 March 2018 concerning your use of the crowned portcullis on a letter recently distributed to addresses in Earlsfield.

The Inquiry

The allegation I will investigate is that by including the crowned portcullis on letters sent to constituents "*Introducing your Earlsfield local Labour team*", you have acted contrary to paragraph 9 of the *Rules for the use of stationery and postage-paid envelopes provided by the House of Commons, and for the use of the crowned portcullis*[1] and, in so doing, have breached paragraph 15 of the *House of Commons Code of Conduct for Members.*[2]

I enclose a copy of Mr Jennings' letter and the enclosure. Please note I have redacted the names of the individuals to whom the letter was addressed.

The Code of Conduct for Members and relevant rules

[1] http://www.parliament.uk/documents/facilities/Accommodation-and-Logistics/Stationery-rules-March-2015.pdf

[2] https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201516/cmcode/1076/107601.htm

The Code, in paragraph 15, provides that

> *'Members are personally responsible and accountable for ensuring that their use of any expenses, allowances, facilities and services provided from the public purse is in accordance with the rules laid down on these matters. Members shall ensure that their use of public resources is always in support of their parliamentary duties. It should not confer any undue personal or financial benefit on themselves or anyone else, or confer undue advantage on a political organisation.'*

I enclose a copy of the Rules for the use of stationery and postage-paid envelopes provided by the House of Commons, and for the use of the crowned portcullis.[3] The rules include the following statement.

> *"Principles*
>
> *2. The rules cannot be expected to cover every eventuality; Members should therefore always behave with probity and integrity when using House-provided stationery and postage. Members should regard themselves as personally responsible and accountable for the use of House-provided stationery, and postage...."*

Paragraph 3 of the rules gives examples of purposes for which House-provided stationery should not be used. Paragraph 8 gives examples of permissible uses.

Paragraph 9 of the rules deals specifically with the use of the crowned portcullis.

> *"The principal emblem of the House is the crowned portcullis. It is a royal badge and its use by the House has been formally authorised by licence granted by Her Majesty the Queen. It should not be used where its authentication of a connection with the House is inappropriate, or where there is a risk that its use might wrongly be regarded or represented as having the authority of the House...."*

I would be grateful for your response to this complaint, taking into account the *Code of Conduct* and the *Rules for the use of Stationery and postage-paid envelopes provided by the House of Commons, and for the Use of the crowned portcullis* (a hard copy of which I enclose).

It would be helpful to have the following information.

- Given the footnote which says, "*Paid for and delivered by local Labour volunteers, at no cost to the taxpayer*", please describe the steps you took

[3] http://www.parliament.uk/documents/facilities/Accommodation-and-Logistics/Stationery-rules-March-2015.pdf

to ensure that no publicly funded resources were used in the production of this letter;

- Whether you took advice from the House authorities before using the crowned portcullis on the letter "*Promoted by [name redacted] on behalf of Wandsworth Labour….*"

  — If you did, please say from whom and describe the advice given (providing copies of any correspondence on the matter);

- Whether you consider the correspondence might reasonably be regarded as intended for the benefit of a political organisation;

- Whether you consider your use of the crowned portcullis on such correspondence falls within the rules and, if so, the basis for that belief;

- How many similar letters have been sent since your election in June 2016 and to which parts of your constituency (providing details of the text if different from this letter)

- Why your House of Commons postal address was included in your contact details

Any other comments you wish to make would be most welcome.

I enclose a copy of the *Commissioner's Information Note*[4], which sets out the procedure for inquiries. I am writing to Mr Jennings to let him know that I have decided to begin an inquiry into this matter. I will shortly update my parliamentary web pages to show that I am conducting an inquiry into an allegation into an alleged breach of paragraph 15 of the Code of Conduct. My office will not comment further on any aspect of the inquiry to third parties. They will, however, confirm that I have begun an inquiry if asked before this information is posted on my webpages and they will answer factual questions about the standards system more generally, including those about the inquiry procedures.

My inquiries are conducted in private. This letter, and any subsequent correspondence between us, is protected by parliamentary privilege. Until such time as any final report is published, the contents of our correspondence should not be disclosed to any third party. (Any such report will include all the relevant evidence, including copies of our correspondence.) I would, therefore, ask that you respect that confidentiality. I have made a similar request of Mr Jennings.

---

[4] http://www.parliament.uk/documents/pcfs/New%20Website%20Documents/PCS-Information-Note.pdf

As a matter of courtesy, I should say now that I may make enquiries of the relevant House authorities in due course. If that is necessary, the correspondence will be shared with you. While I do not, at this stage, know whether it will be necessary to interview you about this matter, it would be open to you to be accompanied at any such interview.

Action

I would appreciate your help and co-operation, and welcome your comments on the allegation, together with any evidence you feel may assist my investigation, as soon as possible and no later than 13 March 2018.

5 March 2018

3. Email from Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP to the Commissioner, 13 March 2018

Thank you for your letter dated 5th March regarding a letter you have received from Mr Jennings. Please take this letter as my response, though I would also welcome the opportunity to be interviewed about this matter.

I became an MP during a Parliamentary by-election in 2016, it was a time of great upheaval where very little guidance was given – a Member of Parliament had been murdered on my election day, the UK had voted to leave the European Union the week of my "induction" and the Prime Minister had resigned the week I swore in. I had no members of staff and the Labour Party had voted no confidence in its leader. As someone who had never worked in Parliament before, who was not familiar with the processes and procedures of the House, and who personally never a full traditional induction – I was left very much asking questions without any answers.

I was approached by someone to discuss the Members Register of Interests and how that operates, and my Office Manager (once in post) was given an induction by IPSA. The induction by IPSA later turned out to have missed many key aspects of the role and they have since apologised for this.

During our IPSA induction, we were told that where an MP undertakes work of a party-political nature – this cannot come at the cost of the taxpayer. Sangeeta Kumar, our MP Account Manager at the time was clear that anything produced which may be used for party political purposes cannot be paid for by IPSA/the House – which I completely agree with.

I got a letterhead designed privately, which is the one used in this case. I have ordered two batches of this letter. The first batch was used for my Parliamentary function (responding to casework, writing to local residents about local issues, writing to Ministers etc), they were not party political. These were all used prior to May 2017, these were paid for[by Tooting Labour party].

I then wanted to order a new batch of letterheads, for use as the MP and for party political use, to avoid any cost to the taxpayer – I ordered these in September 2017 and Tooting Labour Party paid for them. During my IPSA induction, I was merely told that anything party political must be paid for separately, I was not told that I cannot use the crowned Portcullis badge on items that may be used for party political purposes.

I believe I was very open, on the letter, in making clear that absolutely none of the cost associated with the production was paid for by the taxpayer. The letterhead was paid for by the Labour Party, it was printed on a printer owned by the Labour Party, the envelope was paid for by the Labour Party, it was printed and designed by a Labour Party member of staff at a Labour Party office and it was delivered by Labour volunteers. I did not hide this fact and made clear at the bottom that it was "paid for and delivered by local Labour volunteers, at no cost to the taxpayer". The invoice for the letterhead is attached along with confirmation that it was paid for by Tooting Labour Party[5]. There have been three different variations of this letter go out, introducing the Labour candidates in Nightingale and Bedford wards, they are all attached.

This letterhead has been used to write to local residents in response to casework queries, it has been used to write to Government Ministers, it has been used to write to residents on small localised issues – all in conjunction with my role as an MP. My website, phone number, email address and a written address are all included in the letterhead because I want voters to be able to contact me in my capacity as MP.

I believe I have done the right thing in making sure my letterhead was produced at no cost to the taxpayer.

At no point has the letter claimed to carry the authority of the house, my letter makes clear that it was printed and produced by the Labour Party at no cost to the taxpayer.

If I have broken the rules with regards to the use of the crowned portcullis, then I sincerely apologise and will ensure it doesn't happen again. I was not aware of these rules prior to sending out this letter, I was not aware that the House has a service by which MPs can check artwork - this was never made clear to me until now.

Now the rules have been made clear to me, I believe it is a reasonable assumption to make that had the crowned portcullis badge not appeared at the top of my letterhead – I would have done nothing wrong here. The next letterhead I print will not include a crowned portcullis badge and I will ask Parliamentary authorities to check it beforehand.

I hope this letter makes my position clear.

[5] The invoice has not been reproduced here as it is not relevant to my decision.

13 March 2018

4. Letter from the Commissioner to Clerk of the Journals, 14 March 2018

I would like to ask your advice about an allegation I am investigating concerning the conduct of Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP. It is alleged that Dr Allin-Khan misused the crowned portcullis on letters sent to constituents entitled "*Introducing your Earlsfield local Labour team*".

I enclose copies of the relevant correspondence. I would be grateful for your advice on the application of paragraph 9 of the *Rules for the use of stationery and postage-paid envelopes provided by the House of Commons, and for the use of the crowned portcullis.*

Please would you tell me how you would have advised Dr Allin-Khan about the appropriateness of using stationery bearing the crowned portcullis to write in the terms that she did if you had had the information provided in her letter to me. I hope that this would have been sufficient for you to form a clear view.

As you can see from the correspondence, Dr Allin-Khan has assured me that no House-provided resources were used in this mailing and I have not, therefore, sought advice from the Director of Accommodation and Logistics Services. I am writing separately to the Registrar of Members' Financial Interests to ask if she has any relevant information arising from the Registration team's routine meeting with Dr Allin-Khan on her election in 2016.

14 March 2018

5. Letter from the Commissioner to the Registrar, 14 March 2018

I would like to ask you advice about an allegation I am investigating concerning the conduct of Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP. It is alleged that Dr Allin-Khan misused the crowned portcullis on letters sent to constituents entitled "*Introducing your Earlsfield local Labour team*".

I enclose copies of the relevant correspondence. I am seeking advice from the Principal Clerk about Dr Allin-Khan's use of the crowned portcullis but, as you will see from Dr Allin-Khan's letter, she makes reference to a meeting with the Registration team on her election to Parliament in 2016.

I would be grateful if you would let me have copies of any notes or other information your team holds relating to that meeting. If you hold other information which you consider relevant, I would be happy to receive it.

14 March 2018

6. Letter from the Commissioner's Office to Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP, 14 March 2018

The Commissioner has asked me to thank you for the letter you email to her of 13 March 2018. The hard copy of your letter has not yet arrived. It is not necessary to send another copy but it would be helpful if you would arrange for the enclosures mentioned in your letter to be sent separately, either by post or by email, as they were not attached to your email.

In her letter of 5 March, the Commissioner said that she might make enquiries of the House authorities, and she has today authorised the enclosed letters addressed to the Principal Clerk and the Registrar of Members' Financial Interests. (The missing enclosures are not relevant to the questions she has asked them.) The Commissioner will write to you again when she has their replies.

14 March 2018

7. Email from Clerk of the Journals to the Commissioner, 16 March 2018

I would have advised that the use of the crowned portcullis in the attached correspondence was inappropriate as being for party political purposes. Use for parliamentary purposes including casework correspondence with constituents and the other examples given would be appropriate. I would have no issue with the crowned portcullis appearing on stationery not produced by or for the House as long as its use was appropriate.

16 March 2018

8. Letter from the Registrar to the Commissioner, 21 March 2018

Thank you for your letter of 14 March. You ask for our records of my initial meeting with Dr Allin-Khan and for any further relevant information we hold.

Dr Allin-Khan was first elected at a by election on 16 June 2016. The then Commissioner for Standards sent her a copy of a ring binder containing the Code of Conduct and supporting rules of the House, including the rules on stationery. I met Dr Allin-Khan on 5 July 2016 and talked her through the Code and rules of the House, using a standard checklist as a prompt. I attach a copy of my handwritten notes on that checklist, which shows that I did explain where to find the rules on using such things as headed paper. I should say that since the focus of the meeting was on helping Dr Allin-Khan to register her interests before the statutory deadline, I think it unlikely that I specifically drew to her attention the rules on the portcullis which are set out within the stationery rules.

After the 2017 Election Dr Allin-Khan, like other Members, will have received a further ring binder containing the Code of Conduct and other rules. I have offered her personal refresher briefings but she has not so far taken up my offer.

21 March 2018

9. Letter from the Commissioner to Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP, 21 March 2018

When my colleague, [name redacted], wrote to you on 14 March, she said that I would write to you when I had replies from [the Clerk of the Journals] and [the Registrar]. I have received their responses and I enclose a copy of each for your information.

I would be grateful to receive any additional comments you wish to make in light of the advice I have received before I make a decision on the allegation under investigation.

It would be helpful to have your response by 28 March 2018.

21 March 2018

10. Letter from Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP to the Commissioner, received 6 April 2018

Thank you for your letter dated 21 March.

Please note this letter was only received by my office on 26 March [...]. Replying within 48 hours was difficult as on Monday and Tuesday I was working in my capacity as the Shadow Minister for Sport in Manchester.

I thank you for writing to the Members Financial Interests team, as well the House Clerk of the Journals.

In her letter and subsequent notes from my meeting with her, [the Registrar] makes clear that we didn't specifically talk about the Members' Code of Conduct with respect to use of the Portcullis badge. As with the introductory discussion with IPSA, the only advice I was given was that I could not use Parliamentary stationery for party political purposes - which I agree with and which I followed. This is why I ensured these letterheads were paid for by my local Labour Party. When using the letterhead, I made clear at the bottom of the letter that it was paid for and delivered by Labour Party volunteers.

I must stress again the circumstances which surrounded my election as the MP for Tooting and the advice received upon starting. I had no members of staff on the day I was sworn in and it took over a month to get my staff and office set up, but I was given a mountain of post to open, hundreds of emails to reply to, the UK had just voted to leave the EU, the Prime Minister had resigned, Labour had started a leadership election, I had no constituency office and the support I was given was of an incredibly low standard. I have since found a number of items were missed from my induction, and coming from a medical background, with no experience of

working in Parliament - I did adhere to what I had been told. I believe I acted in good faith with the information provided to me.

Could I request that you please contact IPSA to ask them for records on what advice they gave me with regards to use of the crowned portcullis badge?

As mentioned in my initial correspondence to you, had I known there was a House of Commons checking service for literature and had I known that you could not use the crowned portcullis badge on party-political literature - I wouldn't have done so. However, I followed the rules of the House by ensuring this letter came at no cost to the taxpayer (following the advice I have been given).

Received 6 April 2018

11. Letter from the Commissioner to Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP, 11 April 2018

Thank-you for your letter, which arrived here on 6 April. I am sorry to hear that it has been necessary to increase the security for your office.

Writing to IPSA

I have decided not to act on your request that I contact the Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority (IPSA) to ask whether they gave you advice about the use of the crowned portcullis. In my view that would simply cause an unnecessary delay, as I now have sufficient evidence to make a decision on the allegation I am investigating. Information from IPSA would not alter the key facts. The crowned portcullis is a royal badge and its use by the House has been formally granted under licence granted by HM the Queen. The relevant rules are those of the House and any advice from IPSA – if it had been given on this point – would not take precedence over those rules.

Decision

I accept the Clerk of the Journals' advice. The use of the crowned portcullis to write to constituents to introduce the "*Earlsfield local Labour team*" was a breach of paragraph 9 of the of the *Rules for the use of stationery and postage-paid envelopes provided by the House of Commons, and for the use of the crowned portcullis*. In so doing, you have breached paragraph 15 of the House of Commons Code of Conduct for Members. The content of the letter was party political in nature and not connected with your parliamentary activities.

You have told me, and I accept, that you sent the letter in good faith. You stated explicitly, at the time, that the letter was paid for and delivered by local Labour volunteers and no public money was involved. That indicates an awareness of the need to keep party-political and parliamentary work separate, and of a belief that you were acting within the rules. On that basis, I am persuaded that your breach of the rules was inadvertent.

I have also taken into account the Registrar's comments about her interview with you after your election in 2016. I know that the Registrar routinely meets with new Members and the focus of her meetings is primarily concerned with the registration of financial interests. However, the Registrar did draw your attention to the existence of the relevant set of rules, if not to the paragraph relevant to the use of the crowned portcullis. I appreciate that these rules will not have been uppermost in your mind when you approved the despatch of this mailshot.

The design of the letterhead and, in particular, the use of the crowned portcullis, gave the impression that the letter was parliamentary in nature and invoked the authority of the House. This was against the rules. However, the breach is at the less serious end of the spectrum and, as I have already indicated, I am satisfied it was inadvertent.

Other matters

I note that in your first letter to me, you said that you have had two batches of this privately designed letterhead printed and that one batch has been used for your parliamentary work. While it is open to you to do this, Members may order a certain amount of stationery from the House's official supplier without charge, provided it is used in accordance with the House's rules. If you have not been making use of this facility, you might wish to do so. There is information about this on the parliamentary intranet (https://intranet.parliament.uk/computers-equipment/equipment-supplies/stat/commons-stationery /).

Next steps

If you accept my conclusion, with your agreement, I would be willing to conclude the inquiry through the rectification procedure. Under Standing Order 150, I am able to rectify a complaint in these circumstances without submitting a full and formal memorandum to the Committee on Standards. I would instead write to the complainant, following which the matter would be closed. I inform the Committee of the outcome and my letter to the complainant and the relevant correspondence is in due course published on my webpages.

In order for me to implement the rectification procedure, it would be necessary for you to accept that you were in breach of the Code of Conduct and the rules of the House as set out in the Rules for the use of stationery and postage-paid envelopes 20 provided by the House of Commons, and for use of the crowned portcullis. The Committee would normally expect the Member to apologise and this can be done by way of your response to this letter. The Committee would also expect the Member to take steps to avoid a recurrence. In the circumstances, I think it would be appropriate for you to confirm that you and your staff have read the relevant rules and will seek advice if in doubt in future.

Please let me know by close of business on 18 April 2018 whether you accept my decision and the above proposal. If you agree, I would send you a draft of a letter to

Mr Jennings and a copy of the written evidence pack which will, in due course, be posted on my webpages. The content of my letter is a matter for me alone but I would give you the opportunity to comment on its factual accuracy before publication.

In the meantime, this matter remains protected by parliamentary privilege and the contents of our correspondence should remain confidential.

11 April 2018

12. Letter from Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP to the Commissioner, 19 April 2018

Thank you for your letter dated 11 April regarding the inquiry.

Thank you also for seeking the relevant clarification regarding the use of the crowned portcullis badge on a letterhead which I paid for privately. I apologise that the crowned portcullis badge was used on a party-political letter and I now have an understanding regarding the rules relating to this.

In your final report, I believe it would be appropriately fair for it to be made evidently clear that the letterhead in question was paid for, in its entirety, by Tooting Labour Party, bearing no cost to the taxpayer whatsoever. As you have made clear, I am not in breach of the rules relating to usage of House of Commons provided stationery or postage pre-paid envelopes and for that you have found me to have not broken them.

Thank you for your time and for carrying out this thorough investigation.

19 April 2018

13. Letter from the Commissioner to Dr Rosena Allin-Khan MP, 23 April 2018

Thank you for your letter of 19 April 2018, accepting my decision, and acknowledging and apologising for your breach of the rules on the use of the crowned portcullis.

As proposed, I enclose a copy of the letter I plan to send to Mr Jennings. It is the first item in the evidence pack, after the summary. While the content of the letter is a matter for me alone, I would welcome any comments on the factual accuracy of this letter and the evidence pack.

Once I have any comments you wish to make, I will finalise the letter to Mr Jennings, send you both a copy of the final evidence pack. Shortly after that, the pack will be posted on my webpages (https://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/parliamentary-commissioner-for-standards/complaints-and-investigations/allegations-the-commissioner-has-rectified/). You will see that the evidence pack includes all the correspondence we

have exchanged and that the extent of your breach of the rules and the reasons for my decisions are set out clearly in item 11 in the pack.

I would be pleased to have any comments you wish to make on the draft letter/evidence pack as soon as possible and no later than 30 April 2018.

5 Our correspondence continues to be protected by parliamentary privilege. Until I send you and Mr Jennings letters concluding this inquiry, this matter should remain confidential.

23 April 2018