

Parliamentary & Health Service Ombudsman  
Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London SW1P 4QP

Michael Jones  
[Address]

By email:  
phso.enquiries@ombudsman.org.uk

18 December 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Complaint regarding the failure of UCLH NHS Trust Governance Dept. to provide a satisfactory resolution of my complaint to them dated 11/11/2013.**

I write following my receipt of UCLH Governance Dept.'s response to my complaint to them of 11 November 2013. This letter includes a copy of that response (enclosure 1) comprised of a covering letter from Sir Robert Naylor, Chief Executive of UCLH NHS Trust, dated 16/12/2013, together with a further letter from Prof. John Duncan, Divisional Clinical Director of the Queen Square hospitals, dated 12/12/2013. The remainder of the enclosures (2-7) were previously submitted to your office by email on 20/11/2013, as associated background material in relation to my previous complaint over an alleged cover-up of medical evidence at Guy's & St. Thomas' NHS Trust (PHSO ref: EN-173713). I repeat the enclosures here for the sake of clarity.

I am grateful for Sir Robert Naylor having expressed his personal apologies for any distress caused by the issues raised by my complaint, at the foot of his letter. However, the results of the completed investigation included in the form of the letter from Prof. Duncan do not, unfortunately, answer those concerns.

Briefly, the concerns as stated in my letter of complaint (enclosure 2) were that certain specific and self-evident anomalies revealed in three selected images from the scan were left undisclosed in Dr. Heaney's report on the results of the scan (enclosure 5). The inference I drew from this failure was that Dr. Heaney felt unable to discuss or disclose these anomalies, for two principle reasons:

1. The objects revealed in my neck were the consequence of an illicit surgical implantation, conducted by NHS surgeons in my early medical history. As the implants were without any medical precedent, and were undocumented publicly, there was no available medical definition or diagnostic category with which to describe them.
2. The existence of such objects in my neck could only imply the existence of an organised and covert program of medical research, and therefore to publicly disclose evidence of that program would be to break an implicit code of secrecy, the responsibility for which could be assumed to be located within certain offices of state. Such a realisation would

effectively inhibit any doctor from revealing knowledge of the evidence, as to do so would place him- or herself in a position of extreme personal vulnerability.

Prof. Duncan states that he has himself reviewed the MRI scan made at NHNN on 06/03/2013, and has also sought the opinion of Dr. Katherine Miskiel, Senior Consultant Neuroradiologist at NHNN. He quotes Dr. Miskiel's report to say that the "*anatomy of your neck is normal*", with "*no signs of any foreign body or device whatsoever*". He refutes the observations of a self-evident anomaly made in my complaint with the statement "*we see no box like structure behind the back of your throat*".

This does not repeat the explanation given for the two objects by Dr. Heaney in his letter of 03/10/2013, in response to my email enquiry (enclosures 3&4) – it merely denies that a 'box-like' structure exists in the images. In recognition of the fact that the rectilinear structure observed in the three images attached to my email enquiry, behind the back of my throat, close to the brain-stem, is clearly and distinctly observable, even to an untrained-eye, and is evidently of non-biological origin, this statement can only be interpreted as a blatant mistruth. It merely recapitulates the reticence, and hence the cover-up, which affected Dr. Heaney's initial report on the scan findings.

Prof. Duncan does not discuss the details of my complaint which address the reasons why evidence of such an anomaly might be impossible to reveal, he merely refutes the fact of the anomaly, thereby avoiding any further discussion. His response (and by implication the report of Dr. Katherine Miskiel also) appears to be subject to the same constraints noted above which had affected Dr. Heaney's initial report.

As stated in my complaint, on any objective independent view the evidence of an anomaly is transparent and irrefutable. It is merely the case that no doctor working within the NHS *dares* to take on the responsibility of initially disclosing the evidence. This reaffirms my earlier experience in relation to my complaint of a similar cover-up at Guy's & St. Thomas' NHS Trust, that it is a forlorn hope that an NHS doctor might be relied upon to substantiate a complaint against his own or any other NHS department, especially where the contents of the complaint relate to a medical atrocity of such horrific proportions as my own.

I see little point therefore in asking that UCLH should look again at my complaint. The only hope for a satisfactory resolution lies within the route of an independent investigation. I do not make any claim for compensation against UCLH NHS Trust; my only expectation is that they should report openly, honestly, and unambiguously on the contents of my MRI Head scan. Such a report must address the fact of the self-evident anomaly revealed in the images specified in my complaint.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Jones

P.S. A CD copy of my MRI Head scan was submitted to your office with my letter of 20/11/2013, together with details of the location of the three specific images referred to in my complaint.

Enclosures (*UCLH\_complaint\_docs.zip*) in chronological order (most recent first):

1. Copy of response to my complaint from UCLH Governance Dept., dated 16/12/2013, (including letter from Divisional Clinical Director, dated 12/12/2013) (*01-UCLH\_response\_16.12.13.pdf*).
2. Copy of my complaint to UCLH Governance Dept., dated 11/11/2013 (*02-complaint\_UCLH\_11.11.13.pdf*).
3. Copy letter from Dr. Heaney to myself, dated 03/10/2013 (*03-Heaney\_letter\_03.10.13.pdf*).
4. Copy of my email to Jill Rayfield, secretary to Dr. Heaney, dated 26/09/2013 (*04-email\_Dr.Heaney\_26.9.13.pdf*).
5. Copy letter from Dr. Heaney to my GP, dated 18/03/2013 (*05-NHNN\_letter\_18.3.13.pdf*).
6. Copy letter from Dr. Heaney, consultant neurologist at NHNN, to my GP dated 18/02/2013 (*06-NHNN\_letter\_18.2.13.pdf*).
7. Copy letter from myself to Sharon Sully, secretary at NHNN, dated 05/10/2012 (*07-letter\_NHNN\_05.10.12.pdf*).