

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

Michael Jones  
[Address]

By email

25 October 2013

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Amendment to my complaint to your office of 23/09/2013, ref: EN-173713.**

I write to make an amendment to the complaint above, since I have noticed a basic error in the arguments I made in objection to Guy's & St. Thomas' first response to that complaint. This error does not alter the substance of the complaint, i.e., it does not change my allegation that St. Thomas' Radiology Dept. and Guy's Neurology Dept. engaged in a cover-up of evidence revealed by my Brain MRI scan of 02/10/2008. It has no bearing on the content of the original complaint letter of 19/03/2013, only on the correspondence subsequent to GSTT's first response.

In my answer (23/07/2013) to GSTT's response I stated that the Complaints Dept.'s explanation for the anomaly I had pointed out in the three scan images published on my website (images 13-15 from Series 7 of the scan), in terms of "the left vertebral artery" was "clearly erroneous, as the as the object referred to in these images lies on the *right* (not the "left") of the vertebral column". This objection was mistaken, as I now understand that the scan images are laterally transposed, as in a mirror-image, so that GSTT were correct to state that the object referred to does indeed lie on the left of the vertebral column.

The issue is not therefore that GSTT's explanation was 'clearly and obviously' erroneous in describing right as left, but that the object referred to is not at all adequately explained as a "vertebral artery", although it does lie on the left of the vertebral column. The substance of my objection should have emphasised the final sentence of paragraph 4 on page 2 of the letter in question, i.e., that "the revealed structure of this object is not adequately explained in terms of arterial material and "surrounding soft tissue"". The point of contention here is that neither Dr. Hawkins, nor Dr. Andrews, could with honesty have mistaken the object revealed in these images as a vertebral artery, as the revealed structure precludes any such explanation. I do not challenge their inability to provide a satisfactory alternative identification for the object, as it results from an illicit surgical implantation, and is without any medical precedent.

In my letter of complaint to your office I had stated my objection to GSTT's explanation in terms of the dispute over the lateral position of the object (p.3, paras.2-3 & p.4 para.2), and had omitted to mention the substantial issue of contention, as described above. Therefore, to avoid misleading the progress of an investigation, I take this opportunity to correct my mistake, and to replace the emphasis upon the substantial issue in question.

The remainder of my complaint to your office, with respect to the ongoing series of omissions by GSTT, and the failure to identify the “neuro-radiologists” who it is claimed reconfirmed the original MRI Findings report, stands unaltered.

Yours faithfully,

Michael Jones