

FILE NOTE

Case	Registered nurses at Gosport War Memorial Hospital
Reference	12053
Case officer	Code A
Date	13 April 2010 at 16:20 hours
Copied to <i>(if applicable)</i>	file

Source of information

Outgoing call

MESSAGE / INFORMATION
<p>I telephoned David Grocott, Hampshire Constabulary (Code A) at approximately 16:20 on 13 April 2010. I had tried to call him on 9 April 2010 five times before, but without success as his line was engaged or rang out.</p> <p>I explained that I had understood that Gillian Mackenzie had been in touch with the police about the case concerning her mother, Gladys Richards.</p> <p>We agreed that it would helpful if I ran through the history of matters with the NMC, with particular reference to Gillian Mackenzie's case.</p> <p>I explained that on 18 September 2001, the Preliminary Proceedings Committee had considered the care provided to Gladys Richards with specific Code A</p> <p>Code A The PPC had decided to decline to proceed with the case.</p> <p>The PPC had police statements from Gillian Mackenzie and her sister Lesley Lack and a letter from the police where reference was made to an expert witness report by Prof. Livesley.</p> <p>In addition, the PPC had copies of Mrs Richards' notes and additional documents provided by Portsmouth Healthcare NHS Trust.</p> <p>The PPC was provided with a report compiled by Council staff which summarised the contents of the papers and gave advice on possible allegations that could be drafted in respect of the three practitioners and advice on reasons for no action.</p> <p>I made the observation that no allegations had been made by the police against the three practitioners concerned and David Grocott agreed. I outlined the options that would have been open to the PPC and stressed that advice in the Council's report was just that and it was open to the committee to reject it.</p>

I explained that, as neither Mrs Mackenzie nor Mrs Lack had made the complaint directly to the UKCC, we had not written to them with the decision. It was not possible, however, to reopen the case.

I explained that subsequently, in 2002, complaints were made to the NMC by members of the public relating to family members who had been patients and it had received documentation from a number of external organisations. Mr Grocott confirmed that he did not need the names of the complainants concerned. I explained that the PPC had considered the case in September 2002 and had decided to adjourn consideration to await the outcome of the police investigation/PPC decision.

I explained that from records it would appear that Mrs Mackenzie had spoken to directorate staff and her address and that of her sister had been added on a database system giving them complainant status. Following the decision of the second PPC a standard letter was sent to them advising them of the decision.

In preparing for the reconsideration of the PPC's case, it had been agreed that we would write to Mrs Mackenzie and her sister and confirm that concerns about Gladys Richards care had been considered and dealt with and that we could not re-open it and that the letter sent to her after consideration of the case in September 2002 had been sent in error.

Mrs Mackenzie had been unhappy with our recent correspondence and there had followed two letters that were awaiting a response and a number of telephone calls. Mr Grocott explained that he had been dealing with the matter for over ten years, knew Mrs Mackenzie and knew what she was like.

Mr Grocott explained that after the police decided to take no action regarding this case, it had been decided to share the information from the investigation to the NMC and other regulators. The GMC had, as an example, picked 13 (approx) cases and decided to base its case against Dr Barton on it.

Mr Grocott was aware that the families had been disappointed by the decision to take no action and the recording by the coroner. He was aware that having been advised that the police information was being disclosed to the regulators, the families were looking to wonder if their case would be selected for consideration. The decision of the GMC had led to disappointment and the families were now looking to the NMC.

I explained that I knew of one case that was being considered by another team in the directorate under our newer rules. Our PPC was sitting that day to consider complaints that had been made to the NMC in 2002.

Mr Grocott queried whether or not the information by the police had been considered by the NMC as it seemed to only be considering the case where people had written to the NMC directly. I explained that the information that had been disclosed by the police had been reviewed and informed the

existing complaints with the PPC.

Mr Grocott explained that he had understood that there was an undertaking by the regulators that the material provided would be considered and cases selected. He explained that the families had been told that information was being disclosed to the regulators for consideration.

I explained that I could only speak with authority about the PPC currently sitting that I was involved in and that my ownership of the case began in June 2009. Mr Grocott suggested that I speak with Clare Strickland and Liz McNulty about this and asked that I get back to him so that this issue could be clarified.

He added that the police were compiling a report and wanted to make it clear that information was disclosed to regulators for consideration. He asked that I call back or email him on dave.grocott@**Code A**pnn.police.uk

ACTION TAKEN
To discuss with Clare Strickland