Clacher, Daniel

From: Clacher, Daniel
Sent: 27 May 2002 16:58
To: Readhead, Ian
Subject: GWMH

Mr Readhead:

As requested, the key questions asked by complainants:

- Why weren't witness statements taken from the complainants and their families?
- Why weren't the medical notes of the deceased discussed and commented on in detail with the families?
- Why, when there appeared to be a pattern of conduct by one doctor (Dr. Barton) regarding numerous patients, was the decision made to 'dip sample' only a few cases?
- Why and by whom was this decision made?
- Why was there such a disparity in the numbers of people dying at the hospital during the years in question? [It is alleged that the yearly average had gone from c.50 to c.263 - what is the *current* figure?]
- Was Dr. Barton or any other members of staff ever arrested or interviewed under caution?
- Why, and on whose authority have the independent medical reports been withheld from the families?
- Has Supt James ever had any connection with a care home for the elderly, or any private interest in caring for elderly people/and or kindred matters?

I should stress that these are questions asked by the people that have lodged formal complaints with us. Some further issues, which I am unclear on are:

- Why was there a change of SIO, midway through the enquiry?
- Did John James know about the Mackenzie case and the fact that officers had been given 'operational advice' because of their poor handling of the matter?

Derek Stevens has brought in another three letters of complaint bringing the total to eight so far. I anticipate that there may be some more forthcoming.

I now intend to contact each of the aggrieved parties with a view to interviewing them about the specific allegations being made. Once I have spoken to *all* of the complainants I intend to pull the original complaint files to view what evidence had been gathered and what responses had been forthcoming from the other agencies, i.e. CPS, Treasury etc. [Sir, whilst it is *extremely* unlikely that files may be, or subsequently become, missing - it may be prudent for these files to be located now and stored with PSD at HQs. I must stress that I am not suggesting anything other than the need to safeguard the administrative integrity of the files now that we are aware of the serious nature of the complaints.]

In the meantime, I am waiting for Derek to get back to me with details of who will be assisting me, and for the sake of the integrity and impartiality of the enquiry, I intend to work from Netley/HQs rather than my own office at Portsmouth. I believe that this should go some way to answering the concerns expressed by two of the complainants (and any subsequent expressed concerns).

Regards

Dan