



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

#### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

**Age if under 18:** \_\_\_\_\_ *(if over 18 insert 'over18')* **Occupation:** \_\_\_\_\_

**This statement (consisting of \_\_\_\_\_ page(s) each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.**

**Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** 30<sup>TH</sup> September 2004.

**Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded**  *(supply witness details on rear)*

I am Detective Chief Superintendent Steven WATTS, Head of Hampshire Constabulary Criminal Investigation Department and am the senior investigating officer in respect of a police investigation named 'Operation ROCHESTER', an investigation into the circumstances surrounding of death of 88 patients occurring principally during the late 1990's at Gosport War Memorial Hospital, Hampshire.

This investigation followed allegations that during the 1990's elderly patients at Gosport War Memorial Hospital received sub optimal or sub- standard care, in particular with regard to inappropriate drug regimes, and as a result their deaths were hastened.

The strategic objective of the investigation is to establish the circumstances surrounding the deaths of those patients to gather evidence and with the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), to establish whether there is any evidence that an individual has criminal culpability in respect of the deaths.

During the investigation, a number of clinical experts have been consulted.

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

On the 9<sup>th</sup> November 2000 Professor Brian LIVESLY reported on the death of a patient, Mrs. RICHARDS.

On the 12<sup>th</sup> February 2001 Professor FORD reported in respect of the deaths of five patients RICHARDS, CUNNINGHAM, WILKIE, WILSON and PAGE

On the 18th October 2001 Professor MUNDY reported on the deaths of patients CUNNINGHAM, WILKIE, WILSON and PAGE.

The aforementioned reports have all previously been made available to the General Medical Council.

Between October 2001 and May 2002 the Commission for Health Improvement interviewed 59 hospital staff in respect of the deaths, and concluded that, “a number of factors contributed to a failure of trust systems to ensure good quality patient care”.

Between September 2002 and May 2004 the cases of 88 patients including those named above, at the Gosport War Memorial Hospital were fully reviewed at my request by a team of five experts in the disciplines of toxicology, general medicine, palliative care, geriatrics and nursing.

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

#### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

All the cases examined were elderly patients (79 to 99yrs of age) theirs deaths occurring at Gosport War Memorial hospital between January 1996 and November 1999. A common denominator in respect of the patient care is that many were administered Opiates authorized by Dr Jane BARTON prior to death.

The expert team was commissioned to independently and then collectively assess the patient care afforded to the 88 patients concerned, examining in detail patient records, and to attribute a 'score' according to their findings against agreed criteria. A further group of cases were included in this review following a report by Dr BAKER, commissioned by the Chief Medical Officer. That report is confidential to the CMO and may not be discussed further without his agreement.

The team of experts has 'scored' the cases as follows.

**Category one-** There were no concerns in respect of these cases upon the basis that 'optimal care' had been delivered to patients prior to their death.

**Category two -** Specific concerns that these patients had received 'sub optimal' care.

These cases are currently undergoing a separate quality assurance process by a medico legal expert to confirm their 'rating'. Nineteen of these cases that have been 'confirmed', have been formally released from police investigation and handed to the General Medical Council for their consideration. A number of cases

Signed : Code A

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

#### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

have been identified as appropriate for further scrutiny to confirm grading, and the quality assurance process in respect of the remaining cases will be complete by early October 2004.

**Category three Patient care in respect of these cases has been assessed as ‘negligent, that is to say outside the bounds of acceptable clinical practice’.**

The police investigation into these cases is, therefore continuing.

The five experts commenced their analysis of patient records in February 2003. It is anticipated that their work will be finalized in October 2004 as will the quality assurance process by medico legal expert.

As part of the ongoing investigative strategy, since May 2004 a further tier of medical experts, in Geriatrics and Palliative Care have been instructed to provide an evidential assessment of the patient care in respect of in the ‘Category three’ cases. The work of these experts is ongoing and is not likely to have been fully completed until the end of 2004 when if appropriate papers will be reviewed and considered by the Crown Prosecution Service.

At the same time, the police investigation team continue to take statements from healthcare professionals, liaise with key stakeholders, provide a family liaison service, formulate and deliver strategies in respect of witness/suspect interviews, deal with exhibits, complete disclosure schedules, and populate the major crime

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



MG11T

## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

Page 6 of 11

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

#### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

investigation 'Holmes' system a national police IT application used to record and analyze information relating to serious/complex police investigations.

To date 330 witness statements have been taken and 349 officer's reports created. 1243 'Actions' have been raised, each representing a specific piece of work to be completed arising from an issue raised within a document or other information source. This is a major investigation which has required a considerable input and commitment of human and financial resources on the part of the Hampshire Constabulary.

Whilst investigations will be fully completed in respect of all of the 'Category three' cases, a small number of sample cases have been selected and work is being prioritized around those with a view to forwarding papers to the CPS as soon as possible by way of expedition. Timescales for this action are clearly dependant upon completion of expert review of these cases and completion of the witness statements of key healthcare professionals. This is necessarily a lengthy process,

In the event that there is considered a sufficiency of evidence to forward papers to the CPS, it is estimated that this will be completed on an incremental basis. The first cases arriving in December 2004 or early 2005.

I understand that the General Medical Council has a duty to provide the fullest possible evidence for consideration by the Interim Order Committee. I am also aware that they also have a duty to disclose the same information in its entirety to those appearing before the committee.

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by :

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

In my view, this situation has the potential to compromise the integrity and effectiveness of any interviews held under caution with health care professionals involved in this enquiry.

Police investigative interviewing operates from seven basic principles, which are laid out in Home Office Circular 22/1992. The first of these being that

*“Officers seek to obtain accurate and reliable information from suspects, witnesses or victims in order to discover the truth about matters under police investigation.”*

*Investigative interviewing should be approached with an open mind. Information obtained from a person who is being interviewed should always be tested against what the interviewing officer already knows or what can be reasonably established.*

This investigation is currently following various lines of enquiry seeking to establish whether or not any criminal offence has been committed. At present it has not been established that this is the case or in fact whether or not any person is potentially culpable. Once an individual has been identified then decisions have to be made as to what they need to be interviewed about and what information it is proper to disclose to that person prior to their being interviewed.

Decisions as to what the police have to disclose prior to interviews under caution are covered by various aspects of case law, in particular R v Argent (1997). The court commented in this case that the police have

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

no obligation to make disclosure. In R v Imran and Hussein (1997) the court agreed that it would be wrong for a defendant to be prevented from lying by being presented with the whole of the evidence against him prior to interview.

R v Mason (1987) covers disclosing or withholding information, the process must be justifiable and conducted in the full knowledge of the likely consequences. These consequences could affect not only any subsequent interview but also potentially the whole investigation and any subsequent trial.

Article 6 Human Rights Act deals with the right of an individual facing criminal charge to have a fair and public hearing

Advance disclosure of documentation prior to interviews under caution gives any potential suspect the opportunity to interfere with the interviewing of other witnesses who may have information beneficial to the case.

Furthermore the suspect does not have the opportunity to respond to questioning in an uncontaminated way. They may well respond with answers that they think the police wish to hear. This is unfair to the individual concerned.

Finally early disclosure of material can lead to a suspect fabricating a defence or alibi.

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

#### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

The Police have an over riding responsibility to conduct an effective and ethical investigation and a have a legal and moral duty to be scrupulously fair to suspects. In addition the police carry an additional responsibility to representing the interests of the victims of crime and society in general. Therefore to provide a guilty suspect with the ability to fabricate a defence around police evidence does not serve those wider interests.

As the senior investigating officer I acknowledge the primacy of the public protection issues surrounding this case.

I understand that there is a voluntary agreement in place between Dr BARTON and the Fareham and Gosport Healthcare Trust of November 2002, the following is a quotation from an e mail message to the investigation from the trust in respect of that matter.

*'Dr BARTON has undertaken not to prescribe benzodiazepines or opiate analgesics from the 1st October 2002. All patients requiring ongoing therapy with such drugs are being transferred to other partners within the practice so that their care would not be compromised.*

*Dr Barton will not accept any house visits if there is a possible need for such drugs to be prescribed.*

*Problems may arise with her work for Health-call as a prescription may be required for a 14 day supply of benzodiazepines for bereavement.*

*Dr BARTON also agreed to follow up all previous prescriptions for high quantities using the practice computer system and the patient's notes.*

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**





## HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

### **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

#### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

*During a 13month periods from April 2003 Dr BARTON had written a total of 20 prescriptions all for 2mg diazepam to relatives of deceased and had not prescribed any diamorphine, morphine or other controlled drug.'*

I have been asked by the General Medical Council to provide an update as to the current position in respect of four cases previously considered by interim order committee during September 2002.

Arthur CUNNINGHAM - this has been assessed as a category three case and is being investigated accordingly.

Robert WILSON - again a category three case.

Gladys RICHARDS.- Assessed as a category two case by the clinical team, this assessment has been queried through the quality assurance process and is to be subject of further review by the clinical experts in early October 2004.

Alice WILKIE. – No further police action to be taken in respect of this investigation. The medical records available are not sufficient to enable an assessment.

In closing it is appropriate for me to emphasize some key points;

1. There is no admissible evidence at this time of criminal culpability in respect of any individual.
2. The information adduced by the investigation thus far, and the findings of the experts lead me to have concerns that are such that, in my judgment the continuing investigation and the high level of resources being applied to it are justified.

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**



**HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY**

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

**URN //**

Statement of : **STEVEN ALEC WATTS**

Signed :

**Code A**

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_



# HAMPSHIRE CONSTABULARY

## **RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**

### **WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; MC Rules 1981, r.70)

URN //

Statement of : STEVEN ALEC WATTS

Home Address:

Post Code :

Home Telephone No:

Mobile / Pager No:

E-Mail Address (if applicable and witness wishes to be contacted by e-mail):

Contact Point (if different from above):

Address:

Work Telephone No:

Male  Female  Date and Place of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_ Place \_\_\_\_\_

Maiden name: \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Ethnicity Code: \_\_\_\_\_

State dates of witness non-availability:

I consent to police having access to my medical record(s) in relation to this matter	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
I consent to my medical record in relation to this matter being disclosed to the defence	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>
The CPS will pass information about you to the Witness Service so that they can offer help and support, unless you ask them not to. Tick this box to decline their services.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Does the person making this statement have any special needs if required to attend court and give evidence? (e.g. language difficulties, visually impaired, restricted mobility, etc.). If 'Yes', please enter details.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does the person making this statement need additional support as a vulnerable or intimidated witness? If 'Yes', please enter details on Form MG2.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Does the person making this statement give their consent to it being disclosed for the purposes of civil proceedings (e.g. child care proceedings)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Statement taken by (print name):

Station:

Time and place statement taken:

Signature of witness:

Signed : Code A

Signature witnessed by : \_\_\_\_\_

**RESTRICTED – For Police and Prosecution Only**