

**Code A**

---

**From:** Code A  
**Sent:** 14 April 2010 15:49  
**To:** Code A  
**Subject:** Gillian MacKenzie

has left me yet another voicemail message saying there is another case Diane Rogers - mother's name Betty

**Code A**

**Code A**

Nursing & Midwifery Council  
1st Floor, Centrium, 61 Aldwych, London WC2B 4AE  
[www.nmc-uk.org](http://www.nmc-uk.org)  
020 7637 7181 (switchboard)

**Code A**

---

**From:** **Code A**

**Sent:** 14 April 2010 15:59

**To:** **Code A**

**Subject:** Gillian MacKenzie

another voicemail message:

Mr Lavender - whose wife had died

Mr Welstead and Mr Williamson - one was at Nettley Abbey the other at Swanmore - but she can't remember which way round

Mike Wilson as opposed to Ian Wilson - case looked at by Eversheds who recommended that GMC take the case forward but Mike didn't do anything about it because he was having a leg amputation so didn't pursue Jim Ripley [wife Paule [French]] was at Gosport, told he had had a stroke, was moved back to Haslar where they informed Paule in writing that he had not had a stroke but an overdose of opiates [she still has the letter]. Jim is alive and well and is willing to be interviewed by anyone.

**Code A**

Nursing & Midwifery Council  
1st Floor, Centrium, 61 Aldwych, London WC2B 4AE  
[www.nmc-uk.org](http://www.nmc-uk.org)  
020 7637 7181 (switchboard)

15/04/2010

15 April 2010

GWMH - meeting with C. Strickland

1. Hampshire Constabulary :- undertaking by regulators

2. Gillian Mackenzie letter of complaint

"wriggle room" for it to be considered

new information forthcoming

detail of letter of response

LA full PPC report make by

complaint X, Y, Z 2001.  
LA

**Code A**

**From:** Clare Strickland  
**Sent:** 14 April 2010 09:31  
**To:** **Code A**  
**Subject:** Gosport

Hi **Code A**

Do you want to book in some time this week to discuss any issues arising? I am thinking particularly of our liaison with the police. Having thought about it, I think we can reassure them that every single case they passed to us was reviewed. I read all of the material provided, with the exception of the medical records, although I did refer to them when there was anything in the other material that led me to them. None of the expert reports contained any criticism of any named nurse. None of the police summaries of their contacts with the relatives contained anything amounting to an allegation against a named nurse or nurses. Had they done, the cases would have been dealt with under the new rules and followed that procedure. Insofar as any of those cases contained an implied criticism of any of the nurses for failing to challenge the prescribing regime, that issue has been considered by the PPC in the context of the old rules cases, and the panel has declined to proceed. As and when we get the formal reasons I will be able to expand on that point.

Any relative whose case has not been considered by the NMC is entitled to make a complaint to us, and it will be dealt with under the new rules (I understand we have already had at least one of these).

Before we meet (if you would like to) I will go through the records of our correspondence with the police. I am have plenty of free time tomorrow and Friday, so let me know if you would like to meet and we can set a time.

Regards

Clare

Clare Strickland  
Senior lawyer

Nursing and Midwifery Council  
First Floor  
Centrium  
Aldwych  
London  
WC2B 4AE

**Code A**  
F: 0207 242 9579

*different position than GMC  
regulate individuals  
named/identifiable individuals  
only fined  
raise allegations*

*could have  
should have  
made a  
complaint  
could done  
so.*

*however - the PPC has considered  
cases*

*clear public  
statement*

*strategy - disgruntled P  
- times  
- times*