

**Independent  
Expert Panel**

# The Conduct of Mr Patrick Grady MP

Presented to the House of Commons  
pursuant to House of Commons Standing Order No. 150A

Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 14 June 2022

HC 368  
Published on 14 June 2022  
by authority of the House of Commons





## **The Independent Expert Panel**

The Independent Expert Panel was established by the House of Commons on 23 June 2020. The Panel hears any appeals from decisions by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards in complaints against a MP or former MP under the Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme (ICGS); and considers referrals from the Commissioner to determine sanctions in such cases. These are cases involving an allegation of a breach of the Bullying and Harassment Policy for UK Parliament, or the Sexual Misconduct Policy for UK Parliament.

### **Current membership**

Mrs Lisa Ball  
Monica Daley  
Mrs Johanna Higgins  
Sir Stephen Irwin (Chair)  
Professor Clare McGlynn  
Miss Dale Simon  
Sir Peter Thornton  
Dr Matthew Vickers

### **Powers**

The Panel's powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders Nos 150A to 150D. These are available on the internet via [www.parliament.uk](http://www.parliament.uk).

### **Publication**

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2022. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at [www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright-parliament/](http://www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright-parliament/). Independent Expert Panel reports are published on the Panel's website at [www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/independent-expert-panel/](http://www.parliament.uk/mps-lords-and-offices/standards-and-financial-interests/independent-expert-panel/) and in print by order of the House. Accessible versions are available on request.

### **Panel staff**

The Secretary to the Panel is Ian Bradshaw.

### **Contact**

All correspondence should be addressed to the Secretary to the Panel. The Panel's email address is [independentexpertpanel@parliament.uk](mailto:independentexpertpanel@parliament.uk).

# Contents

Report by the Chair of the Panel .....	3
Appeal against the decision of the Commissioner .....	7
Decision on sanction .....	10

## Report by the Chair of the Panel

- 1.1 The Independent Expert Panel (the Panel) was established by the House of Commons on 23 June 2020. The Panel hears any appeals from decisions by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards (the Commissioner) on complaints against a MP, or former MP, under the Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme (ICGS); and considers referrals from the Commissioner to determine sanctions where she has upheld a complaint in serious cases. These are cases involving an allegation of a breach of the Bullying and Harassment Policy for UK Parliament (the Bullying and Harassment Policy), or the Sexual Misconduct Policy for UK Parliament.<sup>1</sup>
- 1.2 The Panel is guided by the principles of natural justice, fairness for all parties, transparency and proportionality. We understand the seriousness of, and the harm caused by, bullying, harassment and sexual misconduct. We are rigorously independent, impartial and objective, acting without any political input or influence.
- 1.3 This is a report of the decisions of the Panel on appeal and sanction made following a referral from the Commissioner of a complaint under the Sexual Misconduct Policy that she had upheld against the respondent, Patrick Grady MP, the Member for Glasgow North.
- 1.4 The complainant, a member of party group staff in Westminster, made eight allegations against Mr Grady, three under the Sexual Misconduct Policy, and a further five under the Bullying and Harassment Policy, covering the period 2016 to 2020. A further, ninth, allegation of bullying and harassment was added during the investigation.
- 1.5 Following an investigation by an independent investigator, the Commissioner agreed with her recommendation that that a single allegation under the Sexual Misconduct Policy should be upheld. This was that in 2016 at a work social event in a pub Mr Grady had, under the influence of alcohol, made an unwanted sexual advance to the complainant that included the touching and stroking of the complainant's neck, hair, and back. The Commissioner also agreed with the independent investigator that the other eight allegations

---

<sup>1</sup> See, UK Parliament, [Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme](#), for more detail on the ICGS and copies of the relevant policies.

should not be upheld.

- 1.6 The Commissioner referred the allegation to the Panel to determine sanction in a memorandum dated 28 March 2022. In her memorandum she highlighted the multiple breaches of confidentiality in relation to the case that had led to significant media reporting throughout the investigation. The complainant had admitted to being the source of media reports about his complaints prior to them being made formally to the ICGS in May 2021; and he also admitted further breaches of confidentiality that occurred in February and March 2022. The Commissioner concluded that the complainant's actions were a "deliberate attempt to publicly discredit Mr Grady"; and "a breach of Parliament's Behaviour Code and a breach of the rules that are intended to underpin the fairness, confidentiality, and integrity of Parliament's ICGS processes."
- 1.7 The complainant sought to appeal the Commissioner's decision not to uphold one of his allegations, Allegation 9, of bullying and harassment.
- 1.8 I appointed the following sub-panel to consider the complainant's appeal and then to determine the sanction to be imposed:
- Sir Stephen Irwin (chair)
  - Miss Dale Simon
  - Dr Matthew Vickers
- 1.9 For the reasons set out in its decision of 4 May 2022, section 2 of this report, the sub-panel refused permission to appeal in relation to Allegation 9, as it was "unarguable" that the conduct complained about amounted to bullying. The sub-panel also stated that:
- [...] it is important to understand that the [ICGS] does not represent resolution of a private dispute between a complainant and a respondent. This scheme is conducted on behalf of Parliament, as part of the wish of Parliament to maintain and improve standards. It is for that reason, [...], that proceedings under the ICGS are inquisitorial in nature: [...] enquiring into events and imposing standards and sanctions, not [...] providing a means to resolve disputes between Members of Parliament and others. In*

*that context, the opportunity for appeal by complainant must be limited to technical, procedural or legal challenges, and it is only in an exceptional case affecting the integrity of the system where it will be right to allow a complainant to mount an appeal based on his or her disagreement with the Commissioner's conclusions of fact. [paragraph 2.3]*

- 1.10 In its decision on sanction, set out in section 3 of this report, the sub-panel found that the “relative age [36 compared to 19 years old at the time of the incident] and authority of the respondent, as opposed to the complainant” was an aggravating factor. Although the House has not prohibited all sexual relationships between MPs and their staff:

*[...] it is obvious that enormous care must be taken if such relationships are to be entered into. Great disparities of status and power exist. Where a considerable disparity of age and experience is added into the mix, it will be highly problematic to initiate a sexual relationship without the risk that there is no true mutuality. [paragraph 3.20]*

- 1.11 The “second critical factor” was that in seeking to initiate a relationship, the respondent did so by direct physical contact. There was “no intimate touching, but this was nevertheless clearly sexual in intent and manner, and clearly inappropriate. This factor was exacerbated by the fact that the context was public, and drink had been taken.” Mr Grady accepted these points.
- 1.12 The sub-panel identified several mitigating factors. Mr Grady did not persist with, or repeat, his approach once rebuffed. He accepted the facts when confronted with them in 2018, and made a genuine apology even if the circumstances of the apology (which were outwith Mr Grady’s control) were unacceptable to the complainant. Mr Grady subsequently underwent training to address his lack of insight into the power dynamics between MPs and staff; and in his submissions to the sub-panel made clear both that he had learned from the experience, and his continuing genuine remorse for his actions and their impact on the complainant.
- 1.13 Finally, the sub-panel acknowledged that the “breaches of confidentiality coming from the complainant have had a lasting effect on [Mr Grady]. He has faced intrusive press activities, and abuse on social media. He has had to change some of his modes of activity as an MP.” It endorsed the Commissioner’s conclusions on this point and emphasised:

*[...] for the future the clear need for confidentiality to be observed by all. In particular, complainants should note that breaches of confidentiality emanating from them, or from those who are associated with them, can act so as to reduce the sanction to be imposed on a respondent. Reputation is vital to any MP and a loss of reputation derived from a breach of confidentiality can be serious and permanent in its effects. [...] In considering any sanction, the IEP must consider the impact on a respondent of breaches of confidentiality, and consider whether that factor should mitigate the appropriate sanction. [paragraph 3.19]*

1.14 Taking all these factors into account the sub-panel concluded that:

*An unwanted physical touching, with sexual intent, from a senior MP to a junior member of staff, even on a single occasion, is a significant breach of the policy. It must be marked by some period of suspension from the House. However, for all the reasons we have set out, in this case it should be short, and will be somewhat shorter than it might have been by reference to the breaches of confidentiality by the complainant. [paragraph 3.29]*

1.15 The sub-panel recommended that Mr Grady be suspended for two sitting days (not including Fridays), make an unreserved apology to the House by way of a personal statement, and also make a private written apology to the complainant.

1.16 I make this report to the House pursuant to Standing Order No. 150(A)(5)(d) as the sub-panel has recommended a sanction only the House can impose. All other information about this case, including the investigator's report, the Commissioner's memorandum, and the identity of the complainant, any witnesses, except as referred to in this report, remains confidential.

**Sir Stephen Irwin**  
**14 June 2022**

# Appeal against the decision of the Commissioner

## Appeal by the complainant against the decisions of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards

### Decision of sub-panel dated 4 May 2022

#### Sub-panel members: Sir Stephen Irwin (chair), Miss Dale Simon, Dr Matthew Vickers

- 2.1 The complainant has sought to appeal the decision of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards (the Commissioner) in respect of Allegation 9. The complaint in this allegation is that the respondent, at that time the Chief Whip of the relevant political party and the complainant's line manager, failed to make any or any adequate response to the complainant's allegation against another Member of Parliament. The complaint is that the inadequate response constituted bullying and/or harassment because it had the effect of "placing unreasonable expectations on someone in relation to their job".
- 2.2 The complainant cites the ground relied on as "the process followed by the Commissioner was procedurally flawed or her decision was unreasonable". It is clear that it is in fact the second half of that ground on which the complainant relies. In effect he says that it was unreasonable to conclude that the failure to take action in relation to his complaint did not constitute bullying in that way. It is an attempted challenge on the facts.
- 2.3 We firstly note that it can be open to a complainant to seek to challenge a conclusion of the Commissioner on procedural or legal grounds. It will be rare that it is appropriate for a complainant to do so. Complaints under the ICGS of course originate from complainants. However, it is important to understand that the scheme does not represent resolution of a private dispute between a complainant and a respondent. This scheme is conducted on behalf of Parliament, as part of the wish of Parliament to maintain and improve standards. It is for that reason, which may sound technical but is in fact of the first importance, that proceedings under the ICGS are inquisitorial in nature: Parliament enquiring into events and

imposing standards and sanctions, not Parliament providing a means to resolve disputes between Members of Parliament and others. In that context, the opportunity for appeal by complainant must be limited to technical, procedural or legal challenges, and it is only in an exceptional case affecting the integrity of the system where it will be right to allow a complainant to mount an appeal based on his or her disagreement with the Commissioner's conclusions of fact.

2.4 The critical passages from the decision of the Commissioner are as follows:

*114. The complainant alleges that having raised the issue, albeit informally, he had a legitimate expectation that Mr Grady would act given his role as the Chief Whip and the person responsible for matters of party discipline, and Mr Grady's failure to act amounts to bullying. However, I note the complainant did not follow-up with Mr Grady to check if any action had been taken or was being contemplated.*

*115. I do not agree with the complainant's assessment. I agree with Mr Grady that the situation could have been handled much better; a written record of their discussions should have been made and a further note circulated confirming how the incident would be managed. However, those things did not happen and as the complainant did not make a formal complaint, he left it open to Mr Grady's discretion as to what action would follow; as with any informal complaint this could have reasonably included no action especially as Mr Grady did not have a written account to rely on.*

*116. It is my conclusion that Mr Grady's conduct did not involve an "abuse or misuse of power" or that his conduct amounted to "offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour". Although the complainant may have been both upset and shocked that Mr Grady had failed to take any action, I do not consider that there was any reasonable basis for the complainant to have perceived Mr Grady's inaction as bullying. It would have been more reasonable for the complainant to have perceived Mr Grady's inaction arising because of the absence of a formal complaint and as poor management of the situation by Mr Grady.*

*117. I agree with the investigator that this allegation should not be upheld.*

- 2.5 In our judgment the conclusions of the Commissioner are unassailable. We agree with the view that the inaction of the respondent may have been poor management, as in fact he has conceded. But on the facts of this case, it is quite unarguable that what took place represented bullying. It is of the first importance here that there was never a formal complaint at the critical moment. Suppression of a complaint or deliberate stalling of action by a manager, particularly as part of other bullying behaviour, might cross the threshold. This case falls far short of that.
- 2.6 For those reasons, we decline to grant the complainant permission to appeal in relation to Allegation 9.

# Decision on sanction

## Decision on sanction following referral by the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards

### Decision of sub-panel dated 26 May 2022

**Sub-panel members: Sir Stephen Irwin (chair), Miss Dale Simon, Dr Matthew Vickers**

### Background

- 3.1 In this case, the complainant initially made eight allegations, three of sexual misconduct, and five of bullying, covering the period from 2016 to 2020. His complaint under the Independent Complaints and Grievance Scheme (ICGS) was made on 3 May 2021. Subsequently, one allegation was tested against the Bullying and Harassment Policy, and one further allegation arising from the complaint, said to amount to bullying, was addressed.
- 3.2 On 28 March 2022, the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards (the Commissioner) handed down her decision. She upheld one allegation of breach of Parliament's Sexual Misconduct Policy, relating to an incident on 20 October 2016 (Allegation 1). She did not uphold any of the other allegations made by the complainant.
- 3.3 The Commissioner can refer matters to the Independent Expert Panel (the IEP) where the matter is so serious that her powers are insufficient for the appropriate sanction. In this case she did so, but added a rider to her referral in the following terms: "For compelling reasons connected to the earlier publicity that this case has attracted, I am referring this matter to the Independent Expert Panel for their consideration." This we understand to be a reference to breaches by the complainant of his obligation of confidentiality under the ICGS Scheme. We address this below.
- 3.4 The complainant sought to appeal the finding of the Commissioner rejecting Allegation 9. On 4 May we considered this application but refused an appeal, on the ground that the appeal sought was unarguable. Our ruling on this is [section 2 of this Report].
- 3.5 The sub-panel were able to read all the material in the case, and of course

the entirety of the Commissioner's report. We were fully apprised of the detail and context when considering sanction. The complainant submitted a detailed "victim impact statement", which we read with care. The statement contained much personal and confidential material, and we concluded we could not copy the statement to the respondent. We did provide the respondent with a short summary of the "victim impact statement", so that he could understand what was being advanced by the complainant as to the impact of his experiences. That summary is annexed.

- 3.6 At our request, the respondent prepared and submitted a "Reflective Statement", in the course of which he considered the impact of matters on the complainant, and set out his own response to what had happened. We do not intend to annex the full statement, but the thrust of what the respondent wrote can be understood from the first paragraph, which reads:

*I accept the findings of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards in full and without reservation. I accept that my behaviour as described in Allegation 1 amounts to a breach of the Sexual Misconduct Policy for the UK Parliament, and I apologise for this without reservation. I deeply regret my behaviour, and am very sorry for the distress and upset it has caused the complainant.*

- 3.7 On 24 May 2022, we held an oral hearing at which the respondent addressed us directly. We reserved our decision on sanction, which we now give.

### **The facts of Allegation 1**

- 3.8 We draw the account of the relevant facts directly from the report of the Commissioner.
- 3.9 Mr Grady has been the Member of Parliament for Glasgow North since 2015, and between 2017 to 2021 acted as the Scottish National Party's (SNP) Chief Whip in Westminster. The complainant has been employed by the SNP's Westminster Group since January 2016. For most of the period that Mr Grady held the role of Chief Whip he was the complainant's line manager. At the time of the episode in 2016, the complainant was only 19 years of age. The respondent was 36 years old.
- 3.10 At an SNP social event held in a pub on 20 October 2016, the complainant

and the respondent were both present. The respondent remained after all other MPs had left. Mr Grady, under the influence of alcohol, made a sexual advance to the complainant in the mistaken belief that this advance would be welcomed. The advance included the touching and stroking of the complainant's neck, hair, and back. The respondent states that when it became apparent that his conduct was not welcome, he desisted.

- 3.11 The complainant decided that he did not wish to make a complaint at the time, but information about the incident reached the senior leadership team of the SNP some months after. They decided that some action was required. As a result, and without discussing with the complainant his preferred course of action, an impromptu informal resolution meeting was facilitated by Ian Blackford MP, which the respondent confirmed took place in February 2018. Based on the available evidence, the meeting was brief and primarily consisted of a verbal apology from Mr Grady. The complainant accepted the apology but made clear in his evidence that the circumstances of the informal resolution were difficult: he felt under pressure to accept the apology and felt “ambushed” by Mr Blackford and Mr Grady, as he had no advance notice of why he was asked to go to Mr Blackford’s office, nor was he told that Mr Grady would be there. The complainant said he felt intimidated into accepting the apology when put in such a situation with two people who had so much influence over his career.
- 3.12 The complainant considers this matter to have been mishandled by the SNP leadership. It is right to state that the respondent had no hand in arranging this meeting. He did tell us, however, that at the time and for some period afterwards, he regarded this matter as having been informally resolved by the meeting in February 2018.
- 3.13 It was of course open to the complainant, given the provisions of the ICGS, to take time before lodging his complaint in early May 2021. It is right to note that this appears to have been precipitated by another unrelated event of which the complainant complains. However, that episode, the response by the SNP leadership, and the actions (or suggested inaction) of this respondent as Chief Whip, appears to have had a part in stimulating the formal complaint in question here.

### **The Impact on the complainant**

- 3.14 We have read with care the full “victim impact statement” submitted to us. It is clear, as the short summary annexed recites, that the impact described relates not merely to the allegation which has been proved, but to those which were not established. In that context it is relevant to note that the investigator and the Commissioner both commented, in addressing more than one of those other allegations, that some of the account advanced by the complainant was in conflict with other evidence and could not be relied on. For that reason, those allegations could not be established.
- 3.15 We accept that the complainant must have been disturbed by the events on 20 October 2016, even if he put a “brave face” on what happened in the immediate aftermath. We fully accept that it would have been difficult for him to raise a formal, or even an informal, complaint at the time. The distinction in age, status and authority between him and the respondent is obvious and forms a key aggravating factor in the case. We also accept that now the complainant has very strong feelings about the actions of the respondent, and that he has significant psychological problems which he associates with the actions of the respondent, amongst others. However, it is highly problematic to identify the extent to which those problems relate to the events of that night. We proceed on the basis that it did have some significant impact, but it is impossible to say more.

### **Breaches of confidentiality**

- 3.16 This was a matter of real concern to the Commissioner, as it is to us. It is of great importance that complaints to the ICGS are handled confidentially. That is vital in the interest of complainants and witnesses. If confidentiality is not maintained, there is a real concern that valid complaints will not be laid, and that witnesses will not be prepared to give their evidence, or to do so in full. Confidentiality is also vital to protect MPs from spurious or exaggerated reporting of unproven allegations, which can permanently damage reputations, even where an MP is subsequently exonerated, or exonerated in part, by the decision of the Commissioner or the outcome of an appeal to the IEP. It is also important for the reputation of Parliament generally. The public deserve a legislature which is properly held to account in terms of conduct. However, it is genuinely harmful to the public interest if unproven allegations are voiced abroad, feeding a general cynical belief

about all politicians.

- 3.17 In this case the complainant breached confidentiality repeatedly in the period before the decision of the Commissioner. There have been further breaches since. We do not intend to recite those breaches, for the obvious reason that to do so might merely exacerbate the problem in this case. The Commissioner herself analysed them fully, and her conclusion was expressed as follows: “I deprecate the serious breaches of confidentiality committed by the complainant in February and March 2022 [...] and I regret the significant impact that this has had on Mr Grady. I consider the complainant's conduct to be a breach of Parliament's Behaviour Code and a breach of the rules that are intended to underpin the fairness, confidentiality, and integrity of Parliament's ICGS processes. I also consider his conduct to be a deliberate attempt to publicly discredit Mr Grady.”
- 3.18 The Commissioner also noted that the respondent had observed confidentiality, in the face of breaches by the complainant, for which she thanked him.
- 3.19 We endorse the conclusions of the Commissioner on this issue and in this case. We emphasise for the future the clear need for confidentiality to be observed by all. In particular, complainants should note that breaches of confidentiality emanating from them, or from those who are associated with them, can act so as to reduce the sanction to be imposed on a respondent. Reputation is vital to any MP and a loss of reputation derived from a breach of confidentiality can be serious and permanent in its effects. In the real world, an allegation will often be remembered, and be assumed to be true, even where exoneration follows. An allegation will often be thought more newsworthy than any subsequent formal ruling. In considering any sanction, the IEP must consider the impact on a respondent of breaches of confidentiality, and consider whether that factor should mitigate the appropriate sanction. We will do so here.

### **Factors aggravating the breach**

- 3.20 The first critical factor here is the relative age and authority of the respondent, as opposed to the complainant. The disparity is obvious. Parliament has not chosen to prohibit sexual relationships between MPs and staff, a prohibition which is applied in many workplaces. However, even

in the absence of such a prohibition, it is obvious that enormous care must be taken if such relationships are to be entered into. Great disparities of status and power exist. Where a considerable disparity of age and experience is added into the mix, it will be highly problematic to initiate a sexual relationship without the risk that there is no true mutuality. Blurring such lines is evidently problematic, and even if the intentions of the senior person are good, that may not be evident to the more junior party. In addition, where such relationships subsequently break down, reconstructing the true history of events will often be an elusive exercise.

- 3.21 Here there was an obvious disparity. In addressing us, the respondent accepted that, and accepted that he had been insufficiently alert to it. He told us of his own background as an SNP activist and staffer, in the different context of Edinburgh, where staff members, activists, and Members of the Scottish Parliament were often contemporaries and felt themselves equals. We accept that may have been so, but that clearly did not apply in the instant case. The respondent should have been alive to that.
- 3.22 The second critical factor here is that in seeking to initiate a relationship, the respondent did so by direct physical contact, stroking the complainant's hair, and his neck, and rubbing his back. We accept there was no intimate touching, but this was nevertheless clearly sexual in intent and manner, and clearly inappropriate. This factor was exacerbated by the fact that the context was public, and drink had been taken. The respondent accepts these points.

### **Factors mitigating the breach**

- 3.23 A number of factors apply on this side of the scale. Firstly, this episode was a one-off. Once the respondent was rebuffed, he never again made any approach to the complainant. Nor is there any suggestion of a pattern of behaviour of this kind. Second, when this matter was raised with the respondent initially, he made no equivocation about it but accepted the facts.
- 3.24 In the course of the hearing, we asked the respondent if he had thought of offering an apology quickly after the event, perhaps the next day on return to work. His account is that he thought of it, but through press of events, never got around to doing it. It would have been wise for him to do so. In

our interpretation he probably was self-conscious about the matter, and hoped it might pass off without any further mention. However, there is some mitigation in the fact that he did apologise once the matter was raised by the party authorities. We accept that the complainant considers the way this was handled was very unsatisfactory. We make no judgment on that issue, since it is not within our remit. But the respondent was not in control of that process. Having read all the evidence, and listened to the respondent, we consider his apology to have been genuine, even if it did not arise at his initiative.

- 3.25 It is also to the respondent's credit that he has undergone training relevant to this issue, both at the instigation of his party, and in the "Valuing Others" training offered by the House of Commons. He found both valuable, remarking that if he had undergone the training before this episode it would not have happened. He would have learned the lesson of the inequality between his own position and that of a young employee such as the complainant. We reached the conclusion he was genuine in this regard.
- 3.26 We also record our conclusion that the respondent was not merely disturbed and embarrassed by this whole turn of events, and regretful of the consequences for his political career, but genuinely remorseful. Sitting as we do, dealing with respondents facing what may be serious sanctions, we are alive to the risk of "crocodile tears" from those addressing us. We are used to listening attentively to learn whether respondents are thinking only of themselves, or whether they are genuinely alive to the impact on others. Here we are clear that there has been a genuine coming to terms with what went wrong and its impact on the complainant, and a genuine conclusion that conduct will be different in the future.
- 3.27 Once he was faced with the complaint about this event, the respondent resigned as Chief Whip. We have looked closely at the timing of that resignation. Contrary to the submission of the complainant, we accept this was not triggered by the fact of press publicity, but the complainant confirming that he wanted to make a formal complaint. It may of course be the case that the respondent realised that the complainant had also spoken to the media. In any event, this matter cost the respondent his major party and parliamentary role.

3.28 Finally, we bear in mind that the breaches of confidentiality coming from the complainant have had a lasting effect on this respondent. He has faced intrusive press activities, and abuse on social media. He has had to change some of his modes of activity as an MP.

### **Our conclusions on sanction**

3.29 An unwanted physical touching, with sexual intent, from a senior MP to a junior member of staff, even on a single occasion, is a significant breach of the policy. It must be marked by some period of suspension from the House. However, for all the reasons we have set out, in this case it should be short, and will be somewhat shorter than it might have been by reference to the breaches of confidentiality by the complainant. We consider that the respondent should be suspended for two sitting days from the House, and that neither day should be a Friday.

3.30 In addition, the respondent must make a full and unreserved apology to the House via a personal statement. We will separately stipulate some of the terms of that apology, and the text must be approved by us before it is delivered. To avoid any doubt on the matter, any respondent giving such an apology must at no stage and in no way undermine or weaken the terms of the apology. To do so would be a further breach of his or her obligations, and such breach will be enforced.

3.31 In addition, as he has indicated he would wish to do, the respondent must apologise again, directly to the complainant. We direct that, in this case, this should not happen before his apology to the House. We suggest, but do not stipulate, that this should be done by private letter, and that the respondent should retain a copy. If both parties agree that there should be a mediated oral apology, then we will be content with that arrangement. However, the terms of such an apology and any surrounding conversation should be recorded, so that there can be no subsequent doubt as to what has been said.

**Annex to decision on sanction: summary of “Victim Impact Statement” from the complainant**

1. The Chair of the IEP has directed that the complainant’s statement on impact should be summarised before being provided to the respondent, given the highly confidential and personal nature of much of the content.
2. The complainant emphasises that he has suffered and continues to suffer from significant effects of the “sexual harassment [...] experienced at the hands of” the respondent. There have been significant psychological consequences, leading to medical engagement. There have been significant consequential physical impacts on the complainant’s health. His work life and social life have been profoundly affected, markedly reducing the quality of both. He has been medically signed off work, and is likely to remain off work for a significant further period. He has doubts as to whether he will be able to return to work in the political sphere, which was his longstanding ambition.
3. The complainant’s view of himself has been materially altered, and he has experienced intrusive thoughts of guilt and shame, even though he understands that such self-blame is irrational.
4. The process of pursuing the complaint, and of drafting the impact statement, have been draining and difficult.
5. Understandably, the complainant has expressed the impact not merely of the single incident underlying Allegation 1, but of the whole history of which he has complained. In one passage he puts it: “My world has been absolutely turned upside down by Patrick Grady’s actions in his role as an MP and my direct line-manager.”