

Summary of material considered for potential release to Ms Nina Lakhani of the Independent on Sunday about contacts between Mr David Horsley the Portsmouth Coroner and the Ministry of Justice concerning deaths in Gosport Ware Memorial Hospital

To accompany an image file of the material coming within the terms of Ms Lakhani's request. All material has been initially redacted by deleting material outside the terms of the request, names of deceased persons and their families, Government, police and local authority officials, a person investigated by the police and police officers. We will have to contact Mr Horsley for his views if we propose releasing anything.

| No. | Description of document | Proposed action – Code A | Comments |
|-----|---|--|---|
| 1 | Section 15 report from Mr Horsley to MoJ official 15/06/2007 about seven deaths in Gosport WMH | Suggest release as per Code A? Any difference because the reporter is not a relative?, but to consult Mr Horsley first | Omitted entirely is the enclosed copy of the police report to the coroner on Operation Rochester, exempt. S.30-31. Don't think it matters who is asking for the info. ? why redact deceased's' names when already in public domain (media coverage). Dr Barton's name is also in the public domain. |
| 2 | e-mail 20/06/2007 from MoJ official to Mr Horsley proposing meeting | Suggest release | ? do we need to advise DH that we intend to release this, as it refers to their consideration of a public inquiry. |
| 3 | Chain of e-mails 28/06/2007 to 06/07/2007 arranging meeting | Suggest release | There's a Code A unredacted (Horsley email 29/6/07 @ 10.25), and would the unredacted reference to the ACC enable it to be worked out who that was at the time? |
| 4 | Note of meeting 21/08/07 between Mr Horsley, MoJ, DH, and Hampshire CC officials and police officers | Already redacted to omit material outside request, but suggest withhold, S.36 | Coroner was at the entire meeting, so is it right to redact down to just bits he contributed? |
| 5 | Latter from MoJ official to Mr Horsley 21/08/2007 asking for further information | Suggest release | Same point as above re Dr Barton. |
| 6 | Letter from Mr Horsley to MoJ official 26/11/2007 with police case summaries – omitted entirely, S.30-31. Raises Oxon-Wilts service inquests funding comparison | Suggest release | Same point as above re redacted names of deceased. |
| 7 | Letter from MoJ official to Mr Horsley 12/02/2008 to cover S.15 orders, with response to Oxon-Wilts | Suggest release | Same point as above re redacted names of deceased. |

Commented [b1]: I think there are several ACCs in police forces, but safest to redact?

| | | | |
|----|---|---|--|
| | comparison | | |
| 8 | Section 15 orders 12/02/2008 | Suggest release as per <u>Code A</u> - any difference because the reporter is not a relative? | Same point as above re redacted names of deceased. |
| 9 | Letter from Mr Horsley 31/10/2008 to a firm of solicitors about the inquests, enclosed with No 10, explaining that he intends to make a report about ** ** deceased | Suggest withhold as not a direct communication so not within request; alternatively release | ? is a letter cc'ed to MoJ within scope. Mrs Richards' name is also already in public domain. |
| 10 | Report from Mr Horsley 17/11/2008 about ** ** deceased | Suggest release as per <u>Code A</u> - any difference because the reporter is not a relative? | Copy of Operation Rochester police report omitted entirely as exempt, S.30-31. Same point as above re Mrs Richards' name. |
| 11 | Acknowledgement from MoJ to Mr Horsley 09/12/2008 | Suggest release | |
| 12 | Chaser from Mr Horsley to MoJ 05.01.2009 on report about ** ** deceased | Suggest release | Same point as above re Mrs Richards' name. |
| 13 | e-mail from MoJ to Mr Horsley 05/01/2009 explaining delay | Suggest release | Same point as above re Mrs Richards' name. |
| 14 | Letter from Mr Horsley to MoJ 07/01/2009 suggesting a public inquiry into the deaths | Suggest withhold, S.36 | |
| 15 | Letter from MoJ to Mr Andrew Bradley 08/01/2009 responding to the point about a public inquiry, attached to No 16 | Suggest withhold as not a direct communication so not within request, alternatively release | ? being released anyway with doc 16. Same point as above re DH, as it again refers to their consideration of a public inquiry. |
| 16 | e-mail from MoJ 13/02/2009 attaching copy of reply to Mr Bradley about public inquiry | Suggest release | |
| 17 | Letter from MoJ to Mr Horsley 28/01/2009 with order for inquest into the death of ** ** | Suggest release as per <u>Code A</u> - any difference because the reporter is not a relative? | Same point as above re Mrs Richards' name. |
| 18 | Order 28/01/2009 for inquest into the death of ** ** | Suggest release as per <u>Code A</u> - any difference because the reporter is not a relative? | Same point as above re Mrs Richards' name. |