

Statement – Public Response to Item 30

This is a public response to Item 30. The mayor's blog [Oakham & Rutland News: Governance Crisis, Oakham Town Council Accounts Frozen Amidst Allegations of Unauthorised Intervention](#) contains multiple inaccuracies about Item 30, so it is important that residents and councillors have access to the facts. I also understand that this matter has been raised with the Monitoring Officer.

Leicestershire Police Economic Crime Department have confirmed that this matter is not a criminal issue and will only review it if evidence is provided that money has been stolen or defrauded. No such evidence exists.

During a period of staff absence, the Council could see three of its bank accounts but could not make payments or transfers because there were not enough authorised signatories available. An application to HSBC, authorised by two existing signatories, was submitted so that the temporary RFO could be added. HSBC requested additional security checks, which is normal practice when a Primary User change is requested. No further action was taken.

No money was moved. No authorities or mandates were changed. Transactional access was never activated. In practical terms, nothing changed.

The HSBC letter does not state that the Clerk had left employment. It simply records that HSBC had been informed that the Primary User had left, without naming the individual concerned. There are several routine ways a bank may receive such information during safeguarding checks, including enquiries about former staff. An authorised signatory has indicated that they were asked about a former Clerk, Allison Greaves, and confirmed that Ms Greaves had left. This is a straightforward and credible explanation for how HSBC may have formed that view, and it does not relate to the current Clerk.

Any consideration of member conduct must follow the statutory process managed by the Monitoring Officer. I will cooperate fully with any formal process.