



Other Document Form

MC7

Number:

TS20

Title EMAIL DSUPT WILLIAMS TO COLIN PHILLIPS WITH OVERVIEW DOC

(Include source and any document number if relevant)

Receivers instructions urgent action Yes / No _____

Document registered / indexed as indicated

No(s) of actions raised

Statement readers instructions

Indexed as indicated

No(s) of actions raised

Examined - further action to be taken

Further action no(s)

When satisfied all action raised, Office Manager to endorse other Document Master Form.

© Hantspol Reprographics 15646/11/05

Receiver	
Code A	
Indexer	

Code A

From: Williams, David
Sent: 25 January 2007 18:03
To: Code A
Subject: FW: OPERATION ROCHESTER Overview report Jan 07.doc

Attachments: OPERATION ROCHESTER Overview report Jan 07.doc

From: Williams, David
Sent: 25 January 2007 18:02
To: 'Colin.Phillips@dh.gsi.gov.uk'
Subject: OPERATION ROCHESTER Overview report Jan 07.doc



OPERATION
CHESTER Overview

Colin..
As discussed..
Regards..
DW.



OPERATION ROCHESTER

Investigation Overview 1998-2006.

Background.

Gosport War Memorial Hospital (GWMH) is a 113 bed community hospital managed during much of the period under investigation by the Fareham and Gosport Primary Care Trust. The hospital fell under the Portsmouth Health Care (NHS) Trust from April 1994 until April 2002 when services were transferred to the local Primary Care Trust.

The hospital operates on a day-to-day basis by nursing and support staff employed by the PCT. Clinical expertise was provided by way of visiting general practitioners and clinical assistants, consultant cover being provided in the same way.

Elderly patients were generally admitted to GWMH through referrals from local hospitals or general practitioners for palliative, rehabilitative or respite care.

Doctor Jane BARTON is a registered Medical Practitioner who in 1988 took up a part-time position at GWMH as Clinical Assistant in Elderly Medicine. She retired from that position in 2000.

Police Investigations.

Operation ROCHESTER was an investigation by Hampshire Police into the deaths of elderly patients at GWMH following allegations that patients admitted since 1989 for rehabilitative or respite care were inappropriately administered Diamorphine and other opiate drugs at levels or under circumstances that hastened or caused death. There were

further concerns raised by families of the deceased that the general standard of care afforded to patients was often sub-optimal and potentially negligent.

Most of the allegations involved a particular General Practitioner directly responsible for patient care Doctor Jane BARTON.

Two allegations (SPURGIN and PACKMAN) were pursued in respect of a consultant Dr Richard REID.

Of 945 death certificates issued in respect of patient deaths at GWMH between 1995 and 2000, 456 were certified by Doctor BARTON.

The allegations were subject of three extensive investigations by Hampshire Police between 1998 and 2006 during which the circumstances surrounding the deaths of 92 patients were examined. At every stage experts were commissioned to provide evidence of the standard of care applied to the cases under review.

The Crown Prosecution Service reviewed the evidence at the conclusion of each of the three investigation phases and on every occasion concluded that the prosecution test was not satisfied and that there was insufficient evidence to sanction a criminal prosecution of healthcare staff, in particular Dr BARTON.

The General Medical Council also heard evidence during Interim Order Committee Hearings to determine whether the registration of Dr BARTON to continue to practice should be withdrawn. On each of the three occasions that the matter was heard the GMC was satisfied that there was no requirement for such an order and Dr BARTON continued to practice under voluntary restrictions in respect of the administration of Opiate drugs.

The First Police Investigation.

Hampshire Police investigations commenced in 1998 following the death of Gladys RICHARDS aged 91 years.

Mrs. Richards died at the GWMH on Friday 21st August 1998 whilst recovering from a surgical operation carried out at the nearby Royal Haslar Hospital to a Code A

Code A

Following the death of Mrs. Richards two of her daughters, Mrs. MACKENZIE and Mrs. LACK complained to the Hampshire Police about the treatment that had been given to their mother at the GWMH. Mrs. MACKENZIE contacted Gosport police on 27th September, 1998 and alleged that her mother had been unlawfully killed.

Local officers (Gosport CID) carried out an investigation submitting papers to the Crown Prosecution Service in March 1999.

The Reviewing CPS Lawyer determined that on the evidence available he did not consider a criminal prosecution to be justified.

Mrs. MACKENZIE then expressed her dissatisfaction with the quality of the police investigation and made a formal complaint against the officers involved.

The complaint made by Mrs. MACKENZIE was upheld and a review of the police investigation was carried out.

Second Police Investigation

Hampshire Police commenced a re-investigation into the death of Gladys RICHARDS on Monday 17th April 2000.

Professor Brian LIVESLEY an elected member of the academy of experts provided medical opinion through a report dated 9th November 2000 making the following conclusions:

- “Doctor Jane BARTON prescribed the drugs Code A Code A for Mrs. Gladys RICHARDS in a manner as to cause her death.”

- “Mr. Philip James BEED, Ms. Margaret COUCHMAN and Ms. Christine JOICE were also knowingly responsible for the administration of these drugs.”
- “As a result of being given these drugs, Mrs. RICHARDS was unlawfully killed.”

A meeting took place on 19th June 2001 between senior police officers, the CPS caseworker Paul CLOSE, Treasury Counsel and Professor LIVESLEY.

Treasury Counsel took the view that Professor LIVESLEY’s report on the medical aspects of the case, and his assertions that Mrs. RICHARDS had been unlawfully killed were flawed in respect of his analysis of the law. He was not entirely clear of the legal ingredients of gross negligence/manslaughter.

Professor LIVESLEY provided a second report dated 10th July, 2001 where he essentially underpinned his earlier findings commenting:-

- “It is my opinion that as a result of being given these drugs Mrs RICHARDS death occurred earlier than it would have done from natural causes.”

In August 2001 the Crown Prosecution Service advised that there was insufficient evidence to provide a realistic prospect of a conviction against any person.

Local media coverage of the case of Gladys RICHARDS resulted in other families raising concerns about the circumstances of their relatives’ deaths at the GWMH as a result four more cases were randomly selected for review.

Expert opinions were sought of a further two medical professors FORD and MUNDY who were each provided with copies of the medical records of the four cases in addition to the medical records of Gladys RICHARDS.

The reports from Professor FORD and Professor MUNDY were reviewed by the Police and a decision was taken not to forward them to the CPS as they were all of a similar nature to

the RICHARDS case and would therefore attract a similar response as the earlier advice from counsel. A decision was then made by the Police that there would be no further police investigations at that time.

Copies of the expert witness reports of Professor FORD and Professor MUNDY were forwarded to the General Medical Council, the Nursing and Midwifery Council and the Commission for Health Improvement for appropriate action.

Intervening Developments between Second and Third Investigations

On 22nd October 2001 the Commission for Health Improvement (CHI) launched an investigation into the management provision and quality of health care for which Portsmouth Health Care (NHS) Trust was responsible at GWMH interviewing 59 staff in the process.

A report of the CHI investigation findings was published in May 2002 concluding that a number of factors contributed to a failure of the Trust systems to ensure good quality patient care.

The CHI further reported that the Trust post investigation had adequate policies and guidelines in place that were being adhered to governing the prescription and administration of pain relieving medicines to older patients.

Following the CHI Report, the Chief Medical Officer Sir Liam DONALDSON commissioned Professor Richard BAKER to conduct a statistical analysis of the mortality rates at GWMH, including an audit/review of the use of opiate drugs.

On Monday 16th September 2002 staff at GWMH were assembled to be informed of the intended audit at the hospital by Professor BAKER. Immediately following the meeting nurse Anita TUBBRITT (who had been employed at GWMH since the late 1980s) handed to hospital management a bundle of documents.

The documents were copies of memos letters and minutes relating to the concerns of nursing staff raised at a series of meetings held in 1991 and early 1992 including :-

- The increased mortality rate of elderly patients at the hospital.
- The sudden introduction of syringe drivers and their use by untrained staff.
- The use of Diamorphine unnecessarily or without consideration of the sliding scale of analgesia (Wessex Protocol).
- Particular concerns regarding the conduct of Dr BARTON in respect of prescription and administration of Diamorphine.

Nurse TUBRITT'S disclosure was reported to the police by local health authorities and a meeting of senior police and NHS staff was held on 19th September 2002 the following decisions being made:-

- Examine the new documentation and investigate the events of 1991.
- Review existing evidence and new material in order to identify any additional viable lines of enquiry.
- Submit the new material to experts and subsequently to CPS.
- Examine individual and corporate liability.

A telephone number for concerned relatives to contact police was issued via a local media release.

Third Police Investigation

On 23rd September 2002 Hampshire Police commenced enquiries. Initially relatives of 62 elderly patients that had died at Gosport War Memorial Hospital contacted police voicing standard of care concerns (including the five original cases)

In addition Professor Richard BAKER during his statistical review of mortality rates at GWMH identified 16 cases which were of concern to him in respect of pain management.

14 further cases were raised for investigation through ongoing complaints by family members between 2002 and 2006.

A total of 92 cases were investigated by police during the third phase of the investigation.

A team of medical experts (key clinical team) were appointed to review the 92 cases completing this work between September 2003 and August 2006.

The multi-disciplinary team reported upon Toxicology, General Medicine, Palliative Care, Geriatrics and Nursing.

The terms of reference for the team were to examine patient notes initially independently and to assess the quality of care provided to each patient according to the expert's professional discipline.

The Clinical Team were not confined to looking at the specific issue of syringe drivers or Diamorphine but to include issues relating to the wider standard and duty of care with a view to screening each case through a scoring matrix into predetermined categories:-

Category 1- Optimal care.

Category 2- Sub optimal care.

Category 3- Negligent care.

The cases were screened in batches of twenty then following this process the experts met to discuss findings and reach a consensus score.

Each expert was briefed regarding the requirement to retain and preserve their notations and findings for possible disclosure to interested parties.

All cases in categories 1 and 2 were quality assured by a medical/legal expert, Matthew LOHN to further inform the police decision that there was no basis for further criminal investigation.

Of the 92 cases reviewed 78 failed to meet the threshold of negligence required to conduct a full criminal investigation and accordingly were referred to the General Medical Council and Nursing and Midwifery Council for their information and attention.

Fourteen Category 3 cases were therefore referred for further investigation by police. Of the fourteen cases, four presented as matters that although potentially negligent in terms of standard of care were cases where the cause of death was assessed as entirely natural. Under these circumstances the essential element of causation could never be proven to sustain a criminal prosecution for homicide.

Notwithstanding that the four cases could not be prosecuted through the criminal court they were reviewed from an evidential perspective by an expert consultant Geriatrician Dr David BLACK who confirmed that the patients were in terminal end stage of life and that in his opinion death was through natural causes.

Accordingly the four cases ...Were released from police investigation in June 2006:-

- Clifford HOUGHTON.
- Thomas JARMAN.
- Edwin CARTER.
- Norma WINDSOR

The final ten cases were subjected to full criminal investigation upon the basis that they had been assessed by the key clinical team as cases of 'negligent care that is to day outside the bounds of acceptable clinical practice, and cause of death unclear.'

The investigation parameters included taking statements from all relevant healthcare staff involved in care of the patient, of family members and the commissioning of medical experts to provide opinion in terms of causation and standard of care.

The expert witnesses, principally Dr Andrew WILCOCK (Palliative care) and Dr David BLACK (Geriatrics) were provided guidance from the Crown Prosecution Service to ensure that their statements addressed the relevant legal issues in terms of potential homicide.

The experts completed their statements following review of medical records, all witness statements and transcripts of interviews of Dr Reid and Dr Barton the

healthcare professionals in jeopardy. They were also provided with the relevant documents required to put the circumstances of care into 'time context' The reviews were conducted by the experts independently.

Supplementary expert medical evidence was obtained to clarify particular medical conditions beyond the immediate sphere of knowledge of Dr's BLACK and WILCOCK.

A common denominator in respect of the ten cases was that the attending clinical assistant was Dr Jane BARTON who was responsible for the initial and continuing care of the patients including the prescription and administration of opiate and other drugs via syringe driver.

Dr BARTON was interviewed under caution in respect of the allegations.

The interviews were conducted in two phases. The initial phase was designed to obtain an account from Dr BARTON in respect of care delivered to individual patients. Dr BARTON responded during these interviews through provision of prepared statements and exercising her right of silence in respect of questions asked.

During the second interview challenge phase (following provision of expert witness reports to the investigation team) Dr BARTON exercised her right of silence refusing to answer any questions.

Consultant Dr Richard REID was interviewed in respect of 2 cases (PACKMAN and SPURGIN) following concerns raised by expert witnesses. Dr REID answered all questions put.

Full files of evidence were incrementally submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service between December 2004 and September 2006 in the following format:-

- Senior Investigating Officer summary and general case summary.

- Expert reports.
- Suspect interview records.
- Witness list.
- Family member statements.
- Healthcare staff statements.
- Police officer statements.
- Copy medical records.
- Documentary exhibits file.

Additional evidence was forwarded to the CPS through the compilation of generic healthcare concerns raised by staff in terms of working practices and the conduct of particular staff.

The ten category three cases were:-

1. Elsie DEVINE 88yrs. Admitted to GWMH hospital 21st October 1999, diagnosed

Code A

2. Elsie LAVENDER 83yrs. Admitted to GWMH 22nd February 1996 w **Code A**

Code A

3. Sheila GREGORY 91yrs. Admitted to GWMH 3rd September 1999 with fractured

Code A

4. Robert WILSON. 74 yrs. Admitted to GWMH 14th October 1998 with fractured left

Code A

5. Enid SPURGIN 92 yrs. Admitted to GWMH 26th March 1999 with a **Code A**

Code A

6. Ruby LAKE 84 yrs. Admitted to GWMH 18th August 1998 with **Code A**

Code A

7. Leslie PITTOCK 82 yrs. Admitted to GWMH 5th January 1996 with **Code A**

Code A

8. Helena SERVICE 99 yrs. Admitted to GWMH 3rd June 1997 with many medical

Code A

9. Geoffrey PACKMAN 66yrs. Admitted to GWMH 23rd August 1999 with **Code A**

Code A

10. Arthur CUNNINGHAM 79 yrs. Admitted to GWMH 21st September 1998 with

Code A

Dr David WILCOCK provided extensive evidence in respect of patient care concluding with particular themes 'of concern' in respect of the final 10 category ten cases including:-

- *'Failure to keep clear, accurate, and contemporaneous patients records which report the relevant clinical findings, the decisions made, the information given to patients and any drugs or other treatment prescribed'*

- *'Lack of adequate assessment of the patient's condition, based on the history and clinical signs and, if necessary, an appropriate examination'*
- *'Failure to prescribe only the treatment, drugs, or appliances that serve patients' needs'*
- *'Failure to consult colleagues Including:-*

Enid Spurgin – orthopaedic surgeon, microbiologist

Geoffrey Packman – general physician, gastroenterologist

Helena Service – general physician, cardiologist

Elsie Lavender – haematologist

Sheila Gregory – psychogeriatrician

Leslie Pittock – general physician/palliative care physician

Arthur Cunningham – palliative care physician.

Many of the concerns raised by Dr WILCOCK were reflected by expert Geriatrician Dr David BLACK and other experts commissioned, the full details being contained within their reports.

There was however little consensus between the two principal experts Drs BLACK and WILCOCK as to whether the category 3 patients were in irreversible end stage terminal decline, and little consensus as to whether negligence more than minimally contributed towards the patient death.

As a consequence Treasury Counsel and the Crown Prosecution Service concluded in December 2006 that having regard to overall expert evidence it could not be proved that Doctors were negligent to criminal standard.

Whilst the medical evidence obtained by police was detailed and complex it did not prove that drugs contributed substantially towards death.

Even if causation could be proved there was not sufficient evidence to prove that the conduct of doctors was so bad as to be a crime and there was no realistic prospect of conviction.

Family group members of the deceased and stakeholders were informed of the decision in December 2006 and the police investigation other than referral of case papers to interested parties and general administration was closed.

David WILLIAMS.

Detective Superintendent 7227

Senior Investigating Officer.

16th January 2007.

