

White, John

To: Charles Farthing

Subject: RE: GMC

Hi!

Just returning from earlier.

As you will of course have been aware the inquest was set up in such a way as to stitch things up as much as possible by whoever ordered it. Its a tribute both to Tom and the jury that we got the positive decisions we did; witness the outcomes in cases that were not argued.

The inquest process is very restrictive and even more so if the coroner decides to approach things in certain ways. The key problem is that the coroner is not obliged to pursue matters where causation cannot be established. Overall its a recipe not to uncover things and recent case law has backed this up.

I am confident with Tom. He is definitely "on side" and I trust his integrity, intellect and independence.

Tom certainly says he only argued for the questions in the form of his written submissions. The origin of the "therapeutic question" was from the coroner himself.

The latest I have heard is that the coroner *is not intending to produce a report*. This may not necessarily be a bad thing and leads in to your last point. We have benefitted from the inquest so far but at what point do we decide to leave it behind because of the flaws within it. Tactically I would like to think over this last point more.

I hope this is helpful. There is of course still much to do.

I am out of the office until later tomorrow afternoon.

Best wishes

Code A

From: Charles Farthing

Code A

Sent: 20 June 2009 08:39

To: White, John

Subject: GMC

Dear John,

As you may have seen in the press, I had my session at the GMC the other day and, from my viewpoint, it seemed to go well apart from Jenkins trying to make me appear extreme by bringing up my comments on the coroner in 1998, however true they might have been.

That brings me to wonder about the efficacy of Bradley and, **possibly Tom**. You probably heard about my spat with Tom half way through the inquest when I questioned his loyalties. On reflection though, I do wonder if I had touched a raw nerve and, in fact, they had both been got at one way or another (knowing as I do that Tom was also a part-time coroner)?

I was given a copy of the GMC's charges after my time on the stand. These are very extensive, covering all 12 cases they are looking into, and Barton has admitted many of them already. With more incisive questioning, I do wonder how much of this information should have come out at the inquest, as it would have made the coroner's three questions look inept, which of course they were.

I would like to know where the **therapeutic question came from in particular, and who authorised it in the form it was presented?** Were the drugs justifiable would have made much more sense, and would no double have brought a different answer from the jury. I would be very grateful if you could make enquiries about this John as my intuition tells me that there is something seriously wrong here.

Also, where is the **coroner's report?** Surely the written verdicts should be available by now.

Finally, I would appreciate your views on whether it would be possible to somehow **rubbish Bradley's inquest** in light of Barton's admissions. If you haven't already got a copy, I will happily forward the document I was given.

VRW

Code A

h

22/06/2009