

You can contact me on: 0300 061 4520
paul.farrell@ombudsman.org.uk

Our reference: HS-180294/0084



In Confidence
Mr Michael Jones



14 March 2014

Dear Mr Jones

Your complaint about University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

I am writing to you about our investigation into your complaint about University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation (the Trust). I would like to introduce myself as the Investigator handling your complaint.

I enclose with this letter a copy of the draft report that explains the provisional conclusions of our investigation. A copy of this draft report has also been sent to the Trust.

You will see from paragraph 2 of the draft report that we changed our summary of your complaint in response to the comments you made in your email of 13 January 2014. You will also see that the draft report does not uphold your complaint. The provisional findings are set out in paragraphs 3 to 5.

If you have any comments or questions about the draft report, including its provisional findings, or if you believe there are significant gaps or facts that are not correct, please let me know by no later than **28 March 2014**. I am happy to discuss questions over the telephone, but it would be helpful to receive any detailed comments either in writing or by email. Please send me any relevant supporting evidence that you have.

If you are not able to comment by **28 March 2014**, please let me know as soon as possible. If we do not hear from you, we may finish the final report without your comments. Even if you are happy with the report and have nothing to say, please let me know.



Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Enquiries: 0345 015 4033
Fax: 0300 061 4000
Email: phso.enquiries@ombudsman.org.uk
www.ombudsman.org.uk

This draft report contains confidential information. By law, our investigations must be carried out in private and there are legal restrictions on sharing with other people the information that we give you. This means that you can share the draft report with those you need to (for example, a representative or someone helping you) in order to give us your comments on it. However, the draft report and the information in it must not be made public by you or by anyone you show it to.

We will look carefully at any comments from you and the Trust before we complete our report, but we cannot guarantee that we will make changes to the report as a result.

The final report will be sent to you and the Trust at the same time.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. Farrell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P" and a long, sweeping underline.

Paul Farrell
Investigator

Enc: 1

Health Service Commissioners Act 1993

Report by the Health Service Ombudsman for England of an investigation into a complaint made by Mr Michael Jones

Introduction

1. This is the draft report on the investigation into Mr Jones' complaint about University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (the Trust).

The complaint

2. Mr Jones complains that an MRI scan taken on 6 March 2013 indicates structures in his neck that three specialists at the Trust have not adequately addressed or explained. He complains that these specialists have deliberately lied about the structures and that this may be due to pressure upon NHS staff with regards to covert medical research. Mr Jones says that it is important to him to be able to establish the truth of his medical condition, and that the only outcome he seeks is an open and accurate report on the contents of the MRI scan.

Our decision

3. We looked at the relevant evidence in this case, including Mr Jones' clinical records, the MRI scan images he sent to us, and the papers relating to his complaint to the Trust. We also took advice from one of our medical advisers (the Medical Adviser).

4. The Medical Adviser carefully examined the MRI scan images and said that they do not show evidence of any artificial structures in Mr Jones' neck. The consultant neurologist, divisional clinical director, and senior consultant neuroradiologist from the Trust all reached the same conclusion. They clearly explained their view in the letters that were sent to Mr Jones in response to his complaint.

5. That being the case, we do not find that the scans show any evidence of artificial structures in Mr Jones' neck. We also consider that Mr Jones was given an accurate, evidence-based explanation about the MRI scan by the Trust. While we hope that our report provides Mr Jones with assurances that he has received the open and accurate account he was seeking, we do not propose to uphold his complaint about the Trust.