

**Code A**

16<sup>th</sup> December 2004

Nigel Niven  
 Operation Rochester  
 Hampshire Constabulary  
 Freepost NAT14825  
 FAREHAM  
 PO16 0BR

Dear Mr Niven

I am writing in response to your letter dated 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2004 regarding the outcome of the police investigation into the death of my Grandmother Mrs Alice Wilkie.

Firstly, I would like to explain the delay in getting back to you. The news that Hampshire Constabulary has no intention of taking my Grandmother's case any further came as a blow to my family and myself. We needed some time to think things through and decide what our next steps were going to be.

I am not happy that the police have no intention of continuing with the investigation in this case. I do not agree that it is the right course of action and will not, at this stage, be giving permission for the GMC or NMC to be given our files. I will not allow this until I am satisfied that there is no course of action available to us criminally, and at this stage I am not satisfied.

To say that the care my Grandmother received was 'sub-optimal' is an understatement. I would like to raise a couple of issues with the expert review you sent to us. Firstly, it would have been nice if the detail in the report were at least correct. If you have a look at it you may notice that the dates are incorrect and my Grandmother did not enter the War Memorial on 6<sup>th</sup> April 1998. A typing mistake maybe, but not very confidence inspiring.

More importantly, however, I do not accept Dr Naysmith's postulation that my Grandmother would have died of her dementia in the hospital at that time. Can you provide evidence of this? Is there anything, anywhere to say that this was going to be the case? Until the UTI my Grandmother had been in strong physical shape and her case notes suggest she was sent to the War Memorial for observation and assessment and would be assessed for suitable accommodation in a number of weeks. At no point was palliative care discussed and there was nothing to suggest that her dementia would have caused her death at this time.

Furthermore, the experts raise the question of why 30mgs of Diamorphine were administered to, I quote, 'a frail, elderly lady, with NO MALIGNANT DISEASE OR FRACTURE...'. If this is the case, then I do not accept that this case can be dropped.

*Kuman*  
*Michael*  
*very good*  
*needed.*

The excuse of a lack of evidence in the medical notes does not answer the question why this dose was given for no reason. Surely, there should be questions asked, serious questions, about this?

As you obviously have no intention of taking this further, I will await the 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 and then utilise my rights under the Freedom of Information Act in order to gain access to the files and reserve any further decisions until this time. I would be grateful if you could advise me if there are any specific steps I need to take to make this formal request in the New Year. If there isn't, I will make my application in writing at the appropriate time. I do not believe that there should be any reason why I cannot gain access to the files under this Act. I have no malicious intention in accessing the information held in them, it should not affect an ongoing investigation, as you are no longer investigating, and I don't think that the public interest issue is applicable here.

Thank you for your time.

Yours sincerely

**Code A**

**Code A**