

<b>CYNGOR SIR YNYS MON / ISLE OF ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL</b>	
<b>COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>Standards Committee</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>18 June 2026</b>
<b>REPORT TITLE:</b>	<b>Decisions by the Adjudication Panel for Wales</b>
<b>PURPOSE OF THE REPORT:</b>	<b>To provide information about the matters considered by the Adjudication Panel for Wales and published between 1 January and 30 April 2026</b>
<b>REPORT BY:</b>	<b>Lisa Lord Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer (Locum) LisaLord@ynysmon.llyw.cymru</b>
<b>LINK OFFICER:</b>	<b>Lynn Ball Director of Function (Council Business) / Monitoring Officer lboxcs@ynysmon.llyw.cymru</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Adjudication Panel for Wales (APW) was established by the Local Government Act 2000. It has two statutory functions:

- To form case tribunals, or interim case tribunals, to consider reports from the Public Services Ombudsman for Wales (PSOW) following investigations by the PSOW into allegations that a member has failed to comply with their authority's code of conduct; and
- To consider appeals from members against the decisions of their own authority's standards committee that they have breached the code of conduct (as well as deciding if permission will be given to appeal in the first instance).

This report includes decisions published by the APW during the period January 2026 until April 2026. It is intended as a factual summary of the matters decided by the APW. The reported cases for the relevant period are currently available on the APW website and links to the individual cases are provided below.

It is important to note that cases are largely fact specific, however learning has been noted where appropriate.

## **2. SUMMARY OF THE RELEVANT CASES**

A summary of the relevant cases is detailed in **ENCLOSURE 1**.

## **3. RECOMMENDATION**

To note the content of the case summaries.

### **ENCLOSURE:**

1.	A summary of the cases published on the <u>Adjudication Panel for Wales (APW) website</u> for the period from 1 January 2026 – 30 April 2026.
----	---

## ENCLOSURE 1

### Summary of Cases before the Adjudication Panel for Wales: Jan 2026 – April 2026

Case Details	Key facts	Key findings /Outcome	Learning
<p>Name: Councillor Iwan Huws</p> <p>Reference number: APW/001/2025-026/CT</p> <p>Relevant authority: Cyngor Gwynedd</p> <p>Nature of allegation: Breach of paragraph 6(1)(a)</p> <p><u>Decision Report</u></p>	<p>It was alleged that the Respondent was in breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Gwynedd County Council Code of Conduct which states: <i>“Members must not conduct themselves in a way which could reasonably be considered to bring their role or their authority into disrepute.”</i></p> <p>The former councillor accepted a Conditional Caution for the offence of “Fraud through misuse of position” when he attempted to defraud his employer by misusing money. It was alleged that that it was reasonable to conclude that the Conditional Caution and the misconduct of the member had brought his office as a member and his County Council into disrepute suggesting a failure to comply with paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Code.</p>	<p>Breach of paragraph 6(1)(a) of the Council’s Code of Conduct.</p> <p>Disqualified for 3 years.</p>	<p>The Respondent had held a number of roles within the relevant Authority, including being a member of the Education and Economy Scrutiny Committee and the Pensions Committee.</p> <p>It was reasonable for a member of the public to question how a member could hold such offices, having demonstrated a lack of integrity in an attempt to dishonestly acquire public funds for their own benefit.</p> <p>Despite his remorse, the Respondent had shown a lack of insight into the impact of his criminal behaviour on the reputation of the relevant Authority.</p>

<p>Name: Councillor David Devauden</p> <p>Reference number: APW/005/2024-025/CT</p> <p>Relevant authority: Neyland Town Council</p> <p>Nature of allegation: Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 6(1)(a), 6(1)(d) &amp; 6(2)</p> <p><u>Decision Report</u></p>	<p>The allegations were that he had breached Neyland Town Council's Code of Conduct by failing to show respect for others, engaging in conduct which constituted bullying and harassment, engaging in conduct which had brought his office into disrepute, making malicious, frivolous and/or vexatious complaints, using his office to obtain and/or confer advantage and/or misusing the Authority's resources.</p>	<p>Breaches of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 6(1)(a) &amp; 6(2).</p> <p>Disqualified for 4 years.</p>	<p>This case involved the polarisation of two distinct factions within the Authority over a period of time, a process which caused much bitterness and resentment and the making of allegations and counter allegations. The decision notice states "<i>Whilst this was a very bad case, it was not the worst case of its type that the Tribunal had seen or could imagine</i>"</p> <p>Although the Councillor's Article 10 rights to freedom of expression were potentially engaged, insofar as it was necessary to interfere with them in order to make findings of breaches of the Code, it was proportionate and justified to do so in order to protect the rights of others.</p>
<p>Name: Former Councillor Brian Rothero</p> <p>Reference number: APW/006/2024-025/CT</p> <p>Relevant authority: Neyland Town Council</p> <p>Nature of allegation: Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 6(1)(a)</p>	<p>Complaints made against the former Councillor that he had breached the Code of Conduct in his behaviour to the Clerk and Councillors.</p> <p>The Case Tribunal found little difficulty in concluding that his conduct was bullying and harassing in nature. He was twice warned about his conduct</p>	<p>Breach of paragraphs 4(b), 4(c), 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(d) of the Council's Code of Conduct.</p> <p>Disqualified for 3 years.</p>	<p>The Councillor has sought to discredit the complainants and others and attack both the PSOW and the APW in their dealing with the complaint and adjudication process.</p> <p>The Tribunal noted he demonstrated a lack of insight, reflection, learning or regret for</p>

<p>and 6(1)(d) of the Council's Code of Conduct</p> <p><u>Decision Report</u></p>	<p>in emails from the Monitoring Officer and chose not to heed that advice but rather contested it, on the basis that he was right.</p> <p>He continued to blame others for his own failings and refused to accept responsibility for his own actions.</p>		<p>his behaviour and its consequences.</p> <p>There was no acceptance of the need to modify behaviour in the future.</p> <p>There was a lack of understanding or acceptance of the misconduct and any consequences such as the undermining of a council employee and the distress caused to her, to other councillors by the statements he made and the undermining of the public's confidence in elected officials and in the Council.</p>
---	--	--	---