

NHS Continuing Healthcare
West Hampshire CCG
PO16 7ER

12 November 2017

KEY

■ Patient
■ Patient Rep
■ West Hampshire CCG employee

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: ■ - NHS Healthcare Review, 8/11/17

We would like to provide two additional points to our formal complaint against ■, sent on Friday 10th November 2017.

Point 1

On request, we received a copy of the notes from the review carried out in April 2017. We identified that some amendments were required to make the records an accurate reflection of the meeting. We contacted West Hampshire CCG in October about this. The following extracts are from emails exchanged.

"We have received the notes from the April review which is appreciated. There are a few amendments that we would like to highlight. Is this best done with the assessor next week?"

Email sent by ■ to ■, 31/10/17

"It will be best to highlight the amendments with ■ (Case Coordinator) at the review next week. I have passed your email to ■"

Email sent by ■ to ■, 31/10/17

■ clearly stated that he wanted to make an independent analysis and did not want to discuss the previous review, preventing us from being able to make the necessary amendments. He stated that if we persisted to enquire about this matter, along with his general refusal to consider the previous review / DST, he would end the meeting.

This failure means that the records held by the CCG are inaccurate and meant ■ was content to make a judgement knowing this fact.

Point 2

In the formal complaint letter, sent Friday 10th November 2017, we stated that ■'s original recommendation in the meeting was to maintain the package but with reduced hours during the middle of the day as he felt there had been no tonic-clonic seizures during that time in the last twelve months. THIS IS FACTUALLY WRONG. If ■ had read properly the seizure record provided by the care agency, he would have seen that there was a seizure at 15.00 on 2nd September 2017. Prior to that, there were nine other seizures since 1st October 2016 with no time recorded and as such ■ has made negligent assumptions. As this record was not provided to ■, ■ and ■, it was not possible to challenge.

It has been clearly stated that stress is a contributory factor to the epilepsy. ■'s failings have caused significant additional strain to ■ and all the family members involved in this case. If he had carried out his job competently then this matter could already have been resolved.

Yours sincerely,

■, ■ and ■