

Complaints Department  
2nd Floor Tabard House  
Guy's Hospital  
Great Maze Pond  
London SE1 9RT

Michael Jones  
[Address]

19 March 2013

Patient Number: XXXXXXXX

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Complaint regarding the process of reports made on the findings, and subsequent consultation over, my Brain MRI scan (made on 02/10/2008):**

I write to make a formal complaint about services provided to myself within the Guy's and St. Thomas' NHS Trust. This complaint relates to the process of reports made on the findings, and subsequent consultation over, an MRI scan of my brain made on 02/10/2008, at St. Thomas' Radiology Dept. The consultation over the scan was given by Dr. Thomasin Andrews, at Guy's Neurology Dept. on 14/04/2009.

The reason for the lateness of the complaint is that I was not aware of the grounds for complaint until after I made a Subject Access Request for copies of my health-records held by the Trust. This request was made on 29/06/2012, and asked for all written records held by the Trust. It was eventually fulfilled by the Information Governance Dept. on 13/11/2012.

I received three separate consignments of documents from the IG Dept., each in partial fulfilment of my request. The last of these was the receipt, on 13/11/2012, of the MRI Findings Report sent by St. Thomas' Radiology Dept. to the referring physician at the South London & Maudsley NHS Trust, on 23/12/2008 (i.e., eleven weeks following the date of the scan itself). In total, it took four and a half months, three separate visits to the IG Dept., and numerous telephone calls, for that department to comply with my subject access request.

My third visit to the IG Dept., on 13/11/2012, was an arrangement to personally view my online records, in an attempt to locate the MRI Findings Report, which had been missing from the earlier two consignments. However, in the relevant 'reports' section of the online copy of my MRI scan, the only written information was "no reports found". I insisted to the manager that there must have been a report, as one had been sent to the SLaM Trust on 23/12/2008. She said she would make enquiries with the Radiology Dept. I later received a call from the manager to say she had found the report, and I should return to the hospital to collect it.

I now have a copy of the missing report, dated 06/10/2008 (verified by Dr. Scott Hawkins). The conclusion of that report is: “**Minor small vessel ischaemia. No significant intracranial abnormality identified**”. This conclusion had been generally confirmed by Dr. Andrews at Guy’s Neurology Dept., during my consultation with her on 14/04/2009, and in her subsequent letter to Dr. Crews at the SLaM Trust, dated 24/04/2009.

I had obtained my own copy on disk of the MRI scan itself by an earlier subject access request made in December 2010, although this request had not specifically asked for any written documentation. Since December 2010, I had been informally advised that there were, in fact, certain significant anomalies revealed by the scan, but which had clearly not been disclosed by St. Thomas’ Radiology Dept., or by Dr. Andrews during my subsequent consultation with her. During 2011-2012, I went to some lengths to investigate this issue, and tried to obtain formal expert corroboration from neurologists to confirm these suspicions.

These attempts, however, have so far been unsuccessful. Due to the evidently controversial nature of what is revealed by the scan, no individual expert has been willing to take formal responsibility for its initial disclosure. What is actually revealed by the scan is the appearance of a series of illicit cranial implants. The suggestion is, therefore, that these implants must have been placed inside my skull by NHS surgeons, surreptitiously, during a tonsillectomy operation I underwent at the age of five years, without my knowledge or consent (this being the only occasion I have had surgery under general anaesthetic).

Evidence in support of these conclusions, including selected MRI images, as well as analysis of the likely medical and technological rationale behind this enterprise, is published online at: <http://somr.info/report> .

In view of this description of events, and in order explicate what appears to be evidence of a serial cover-up across two separate departments within Guy’s & St. Thomas’ NHS Trust, this complaint requests a response from the Complaints Dept. to address the following issues:

1. To explain the delay of **eleven weeks** between the date of the MRI scan on 02/10/2008, and the sending of the MRI Findings Report to the referring physician at the SLaM Trust on 23/12/2008.
2. To explain why St. Thomas’ Radiology Dept. failed to attach the MRI Findings Report to the relevant section of my online scan record.
3. In anticipation of the validation of the suspicions noted above, to give full explanation for the reasons that St. Thomas’ Radiology Dept. failed to alert me, or the referring physician, to the significant anomalies revealed by my MRI scan.
4. In anticipation of the same, to give full explanation why Dr. Thomasin Andrews, at Guy’s Neurology Dept., failed also to make the same alert.

Taking into account all of the evidence which I have collected in the preceding years, and which is presented at the Internet address quoted above, my own conclusions regarding these issues, pending an explanation from the Complaints Dept., is that, as the items revealed by MRI scan have not found their way inside my skull by accident, but by an illicit and covert design, their disclosure by doctors employed at the Trust presented the prospect of an unmanageable controversy. Disclosure of the items was then deliberately omitted, both from the MRI Findings Report, and from Dr. Andrews' report on my subsequent consultation, in order to occlude any further attention to them. I further conclude that the Findings Report was intentionally sequestered from my online scan record in an attempt to protect the identity of the reporting physician.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Jones