

Case Scenario

The referral source called and reported the following information via the abuse hotline:

"Dr. E Brown is an elderly client and his savings account has gone from a balance of \$96,000 to \$0.00 in the past six months."

Additional information gathered at intake:

- Law Enforcement was involved in the case and requested that APS visit with them to assess Dr. Brown's physical and mental state.
- Law Enforcement identified that a Mr. Tannen has utilized the debit card for personal purchases.
- No additional information provided at this time.

The referral source made a follow up call to provide additional information. The referral source reported that although there is no known diagnosis, Dr. Brown may have dementia, because he appears to be extremely confused and cannot recall information or events that have occurred recently. He also has not been taking his medications correctly because he does not remember to take them as prescribed. There are currently more pills than should be based on the prescription fill date.

The APS worker and law enforcement visited with Dr. E Brown at his home. Dr. Brown was alert and oriented during this visit. Dr. Brown indicated that he had to transfer the money out of his savings account because he has been helping Mr. Tannen get back on his feet. He stated that he wanted to help because Mr. Tannen has no one else to help him and he is just down on his luck. Dr. Brown admitted that he was not taking his medications as prescribed because he didn't have the money available to get refills. Dr. Brown acknowledges that he experiences some confusion when he takes his medications inappropriately. Dr. Brown made it clear that he does not need protective services from APS or anyone else.

Investigation/Assessment Decision

After conducting an interview with Dr. Brown, Mr. Tannen, law enforcement and reviewing medical records the APS worker through consultation with the supervisor substantiated self neglect and unsubstantiated exploitation. This decision was based on the preponderance of evidence that Dr. Brown was depriving himself of services that are necessary to maintain health and welfare. This was evidenced by Dr. Brown admitting to not taking his medications as prescribed and suffering confusion. The decision for exploitation was based on the preponderance of evidence that Dr. Brown was not deceived or intimidated into releasing his funds. Dr. Brown admitted that he willingly gave Mr. Tannen the funds.

This case was closed at the request of Dr. Brown as he denied needing protective services. The APS worker offered an aftercare plan that would provide additional guidance and support if needed.

Intake Decision (Part I)

The initial referral does not provide information to determine that Dr. Brown meets the definition of adult per KRS 209. Since Law Enforcement is requesting assistance, it would be beneficial for the intake worker to advise the referral source that additional information would be needed about any potential physical or mental dysfunction occurring as well as any deficits in meeting activities of daily living or protecting from maltreatment.

Intake Decision (Part II)

The additional information provides a basis for Dr. Brown meeting the definition of an adult since he is elderly (specific age not reported) and has possible dementia (confusion, forgetting things) that is leading to his not taking medications as prescribed.

This referral will be accepted for both self neglect and exploitation. The referral will be assigned to the county of residence.

The APS worker and law enforcement also interviewed Mr. Tannen and he admitted to using the debit card to purchase items, but stated that all of it was done with permission from Dr. Brown.

The APS worker requested medical records for Dr. Brown. There were no diagnoses related to his cognitive capacity. The records indicate some concerns about physical abilities, but no recommendations were noted.