| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | [redacted] |
| 16. | [redacted] | | | | |
| 17. | 2000/2047 | BARTON, J A | Refer to PCC. | CCPS | The Committee initially was informed by the Committee Secretary that the case of patient Gladys Richards has been referred back to the CPS.<br><br>It noted that the case related to five patients between the ages of 75–91 who were attending Gosport War Memorial Hospital, mainly for rehabilitation. One person (Mrs Lack) who was an experienced nurse in elderly care was concerned about the treatment of her elderly mother (Mrs Richards) in the ward, which precipitated the reviews of other patients. The Committee noted the fairly brief report of Dr Mundy, and Professor Ford's report which looked at all five cases. It noted the background to the case as a whole, which was that Dr Barton was a visiting clinical assistant who was responsible for the day-to-day management of these five cases. It noted that overwork had apparently affected patient care. It noted that in the case of Mrs Richards she had lost a hearing aid and her spectacles, and was |

brought in in an agitated state, probably because of sensory deprivation. She became ambulant with a Zimmer, but her hip replacement became dislocated following a fall. This patient was prescribed the same set of drugs which was used in each of the other cases: Oramorph, hyoscine and midazolam. It noted that some patients had up to 60–80 mg in 24 hours via subcutaneous injection with a syringe driver. Patient Richards received no foods or fluids between 18 – 21 August and died because of the combination of lack of nutrition and sedation. The Committee considered that the administration of these drugs may have shortened the patient's life (which was not the same as suggesting that it killed her). Professor Ford says that the prescribing regime was variously reckless, excessive or highly inappropriate. It noted with concern that the medical records are not signed regarding the subcutaneous drugs regime. It noted the pattern in which an elderly group of patients, dealt with by a clinical assistant, were the subject of apparently reckless and inappropriate prescribing. Death appeared to have been precipitated if not caused by the drug regime in each case.

The Committee noted that Dr Barton's post was supervised by a consultant, Dr Lord, who must therefore assume some responsibility for the events. It noted that palliative care is now a well-developed clinical area. If death is accelerated as a result of carefully titrated, good symptoms control, then as a side-effect it may be acceptable. This did not appear to be the case here, and the Committee was of the view that the matter unequivocally needs to be tested by the Professional Conduct Committee. Dr Barton moved patients very quickly onto a regime where they were receiving terminal care, and ignored the recommendations regarding doses in the BNF, rapidly prescribing excessive doses. It noted that there was a major public interest in the case. It asked that we look at charges 2 (b) ii) and iii) regarding Eva Page, as these would not raise an issue of spm (ask solicitors to look at charges). It noted that the case had been before the IOC which had made no order. The Committee considered that the case of Dr Lord should be screened if it hasn't already been. It further suggested that if the allegations against Dr Lord have already been screened, we might now have more information than the screener had at the time, and it may need to be re-screened. It considered that the nurses involved were open to criticism for withholding nutrition and for failing in their own whistle-

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | blowing responsibilities, and should be referred to the UKCC. It noted that there has already been a CHI report.<br><br>The Committee noted that the documentation which was not included may contain information about the identity of the nurses concerned, and that a Nurse Philip Beed is named at p236. If we cannot identify other nurses we should ask the Trust for the names so they can be reported to the UKCC. We should also warn the press office about the case given the potential public interest, mentioning that other doctors and nurses might become involved. The Committee would like the case to be fast-tracked. Professor MacSween requested that a charge be added at 5 a. iii to reflect the inappropriate use of the word "happy" in the context of confirming death as this was at best inappropriate and reflected an attitude which caused considerable concern. |
| 18. | [redacted] | | | | [redacted] |