Tanner Simon

From:

Hayden Smith Jane!

Code A

Sent:

24 September 2002 09:18 Code A

To: Subject:

FW: GWM

Importance:

High

Sensitivity:

Confidential

Simon -this didn't reach you the first time, so I'm sending it to you again.

JHS

- > ----Original Message-----
- > From: Hayden Smith Jane
- > Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2002 9:14 AM

> To: > Cc:

Code A

> Subject:

GWM

> Importance:

High Confidential

> Sensitivity:

> Dear Gareth

I'm writing as requested by Simon following my telephone conversation with

> him yesterday.

- > I understand that there is some concern on the part of both Trusts that
- > any investigation is concluded as quickly as possible so that the position
- > of the two individuals who have been re-deployed can be resolved without

> unnecessary delay.

- > It is right for them to have those concerns, as employers, because thev
- > have an obligation to treat their employees fairly and the longer the
- > "redeployment" continues, without an investigation being concluded, the
- > more at risk they are of claims from their employees that they have
- > breached their contractual obligations to those employees.

> As indicated to Simon by telephone yesterday, the difficulty in

- > progressing any "internal" investigation (by which I mean an investigation
- > to establish whether either of these two individuals, or any other
- > employee, has done or failed to do anything which should be the subject of
- > a disciplinary hearing), lies in the fact that there may need to be a > police investigation as to whether any criminal act has occurred.
- > Usually, where there needs to be a police investigation, then to avoid any
- > interference with possible criminal proceedings, the police would be
- > allowed a free hand to investigate and no "internal" investigation would
- > begin until the police had confirmed that their investigation was
- > complete.
- > I am not entirely clear what stage the police are at, in relation to
- > events at GWM. I do take the view that:
- > there is nothing in the dossier of papers which came to light last week
- on the original death(s) they > which sheds any additional light
- > investigated in 1998;
- > as a result of those papers, there may be an issue about whether
- > individuals who were interviewed by the police in the earlier police
- > investigations were as honest as they could have been but that will > depend on who was interviewed before. If, for the sake of argument, TH
- > had been interviewed by the police as part of the 1998 investigation, had
- > been asked by them if he had any knowledge of concerns about prescribing
- > practices at GWM and had said no, then these papers suggest that in doing
- > so he would have mislead the police which might in itself be a criminal
- > offence, if he did so knowingly;

> - as a result of those papers, it seems to me that the police might want > to investigate earlier deaths at GWM in addition to those which they have > already investigated, to see if any other charges of unlawful killing > might be brought - but I imagine they will have the same difficulty in > relation to any earlier deaths that they have had in relation to the > deaths in 1998 (in terms of establishing the necessary grounds for a > prosecution); and > - as a result of those papers, the police may well want to investigate > what level of knowledge there was amongst senior managers of the concerns > expressed by nursing staff in 1992 and beyond, and what they did about it, > possibly with a view to a prosecution for corporate manslaughter - if it > could be established that there was general awareness of an unsafe system > at GWM, which controlling managers knew about but allowed to continue, and > which resulted in premature deaths of patients. > I think it is essential that you establish with the police as soon as > possible if they intend to pursue any additional investigation as a result > of the papers now available, and if so what the scope of that > investigation will be - it is only then that you can determine (in > discussion with the police) whether any "internal" investigation can run, > either parallel to or after the police investigation. > (I should say that no details of what the police may or may not want to > investigate should be discussed with individuals at either of the Trusts > who may be subject to such investigation) > I have referred throughout this to an "internal" investigation - it is correct that the result of that investigation would be used for the > purposes of any disciplinary proceedings within the Trust - but obviously > it is important that any such investigation must be seen to be independent > - and as such should be undertaken by someone external to the Trust. > Please bear in mind however, that if such an investigation revealed that > there were grounds for disciplinary action against any individual > employees of the Trust, then in my view the results of that investigation > should not be made public until any such proceedings had taken place (to > ensure that the individuals rights to a fair process were preserved). > Sorry for the length of this email - which is longer than Simon asked for > - but I thought it would be helpful to set out the position in detail. If > you have any queries or want to discuss it with me then do please give me > a ring. > Regards, > JHS > Jane Hayden-Smith > Beachcroft Wansbroughs direct line Code A Code A > email The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer. This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMEsweeper for the presence of computer viruses.

Beachcroft Wansbroughs Solicitors UK

Website: http://www.bwlaw.co.uk/

Code A