



IN THE INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

IN THE INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

Rule 9 Submission – Evidence in Response to Government Disclosures (May 2025)

Submitted by: Richard Newton and Owen McLaughlin

Tainted Blood – Affected Siblings and Children

Date of Submission: 23rd May 2025

Statement of Purpose

This Rule 9 submission responds to the government evidence disclosed by the Cabinet Office in May 2025 and published on the Inquiry's website on 21st May 2025. It reflects both our analysis of this material and our lived experience of exclusion. We represent *Tainted Blood – Affected Siblings and Children*, a cohort of over 440 bereaved family members who have been structurally disadvantaged by the compensation framework and denied meaningful engagement at every stage.

This statement, prepared in the eleventh hour, is not conclusive—we are still reviewing the Cabinet Office documents. We understand the inquiry will be diligently combing through them too as well as our legal representatives.

The evidence is a bitter pill to swallow. It is inconceivable that those responsible can claim to have acted with candour and transparency. Their conduct mirrors the indifference of governments past.

Introduction

The following extract encapsulates the disillusionment and betrayal felt by many of us who engaged with the Cabinet Office in good faith. We attended meetings, submitted evidence, and worked tirelessly to represent the views and trauma of our group members—believing that meaningful change was both possible and



promised. Instead, we now understand that our involvement was never intended to influence policy.

Campaigners invested significant time, emotional energy, and collective effort under the assumption that their input would shape the development of a just and inclusive compensation scheme. This belief was based on assurances that further engagement would inform the second set of legislative measures. In hindsight, it is clear we were misled.

To discover, in black and white, that policy decisions had already been finalised, and that engagement was only intended to “manage expectations,” is devastating. It is difficult to convey the depth of anger and distress this revelation has caused. Victims of a historic injustice have once again been manipulated and silenced—this time by those who claimed to be righting the wrongs of the past.

CABO0000916 – Infected Blood Compensation Scheme Proposal Follow Up
Advice to the Deputy Prime Minister – 13 May 2024 – Paragraph 75:

“It is important that any engagement, regardless of whether it is as part of a formal consultation or not, does not ask for views on matters which are already settled by the government.”

We have presented our extractions within the little time we had to present the following for your consideration within the inquiry in the hope that it will bring the meaningful and much needed changes to this ridiculous, discriminating and unequal scheme which lacks parity and does not represent the final report from the inquiry. Whilst some families will walk away with millions other are given breadcrumbs, the lowest being a sibling without family or estate via an infected person, on average £2.54/day for four decades of suffering is not compensation, it’s an absolute insult.

1. Structural Discrimination and Hierarchical Awards

The 2025 Compensation Scheme continues to impose an unjust hierarchy of relationships. Despite Inquiry findings on the lifelong harm suffered by siblings and children, we are either excluded or placed in inferior categories.



- “Siblings... are not eligible for Autonomy awards.”
(*Government_Update_on_the_Infected_Blood_Compensation_Scheme*, p.18)

Only partners, parents, and children qualify—ignoring decades of disrupted family life and psychological trauma experienced by siblings. Reduced payments for children and parents again imply that one person’s suffering is greater than another’s.

Where was the psychological input in the expert group? Where was the proper consultation with victims? How can a partner of one year be compared to a sibling or child of decades of family relationship? We are not saying others should receive less—but we should be treated equally and fairly.

- “Siblings must have lived in the same household... for at least 2 years under the age of 18, after the onset of infection.” (p.10)

This excludes those separated due to institutionalisation, infection-related death, or family breakdown—often as a direct consequence of the scandal.

- “Downgrading parents and children to carer-level awards if infection occurred in adulthood...” (*CABO0000916*, p.4)

This demonstrates awareness within government that these cutoffs are arbitrary—yet they remain uncorrected. Siblings aren’t even mentioned or other eligible carers.

- Officials anticipated outrage or “criticism” at eligibility thresholds and award levels (*CABO0000916*, p4 paragraph 11)—a damning sign of foreknowledge. Higher amounts based upon age clearly signs of discrimination to those over 18 v those under 18.

2. Death Without Recognition

No death-related compensation is available to bereaved siblings or adult children unless they can prove dependency:



- “Other bereaved people affected people (disabled children over the age of 18, and parents and siblings of an infected person) may be eligible to receive Financial loss awards **if they are able to provide evidence of financial dependency on the infected person at the time of death and for at least six months prior to the time of death.**” (p.47
Government_Update_on_the_infected_Blood_Compensation_Scheme.pdf)

This policy effectively excludes most bereaved siblings and adult children from receiving financial compensation unless they can provide a narrow and outdated concept of financial dependence, disregarding emotional and caregiving relations.

3. No Acknowledgement of State Wrongdoing

Sir Robert Francis recommended punitive damages be considered, in recognition of the scale and nature of state failure. But the government’s compensation framework contains no such provision. (*Recommendations_for_a_Framework–Sir_Robert_Francis_Final.pdf*, p.6)

Additionally, internal minutes confirm the government **deliberately avoided language around liability or apology.** (CABO0000914)

4. Absence of Trauma-Based Supplementary Route

There is no supplementary mechanism to recognise psychological trauma unless one qualifies via care or financial loss.

- “The supplementary route is limited to financial loss and care... no mention of psychological trauma.” (pp.21–32)

This denies redress to thousands of siblings and children whose mental health, stability, education, and employment were devastated by their childhood experience.



- Expert Group meeting minutes (CAB00000925) confirm a lack of trauma-informed expertise in the design process.

5. Exclusion of Estates of Affected Deceased

- “The Inquiry’s report did not recommend that estates of affected people should be compensated.” (p.15)

We have already made our thoughts known that the Inquiry was wrong on this point. Denying estates of affected people creates intergenerational inequality.

The government uses this as justification to erase those who were traumatised, campaigned for decades, and died before redress was available.

We firmly believe their estate has a legal claim:

- *Law Reform Act 1934* – Causes of action survive for the benefit of the estate.
- *Fatal Accidents Act 1976* – Dependents can claim for financial or emotional loss. These are distinct but may overlap.

6. Tax and Interest Disparity

Compensation is vulnerable to inheritance tax, with no interest applied to delayed payments—yet the state charges 8.5% on late tax debts. No inflationary adjustment exists between the first and last claimant.

(PRESS RELEASE – TB: Affected Siblings and Children, p.2)

This adds financial insult to moral injury.

7. Performative Engagement and Gaslighting

In summary as repeated above; internal briefings, the Cabinet Office advised:



- *“It is important that any engagement, regardless of whether this is as part of a formal consultation or not, does not ask for views on matters which are already settled by the Government.” (CABO0000916, Page 20, paragraph 75)*

This is not consultation. This is manipulation. It confirms that engagement with campaigners and victims was never intended to shape outcomes, but rather to neutralise dissent. The aim was to protect the public purse—not to prioritise the rights, lives, or dignity of victims. It is bitterly ironic that Ministers now place such emphasis on financial management, when in the 1970s, 80s and 90’s there was such a catastrophic failure to safeguard the public’s right to life.

At what point did the value of money eclipse the value of human life and free will?

Many affected families have lived for decades suspended in the acceptance stage of grief. We cannot fully process or finalise our loss because justice has never been served. Our bereavement is unresolved—not due to lack of resilience, but because the state refuses to acknowledge what was taken.

This is why the so-called Expert Group desperately needed qualified psychological and trauma-informed professionals. Victims of this scandal have had to retell their pain again and again in the hope that someone—anyone—might finally listen with compassion. Instead, this government has repeated the failings of its predecessors: silencing the traumatised, gaslighting the grieving, and retraumatising a community already drained by decades of state betrayal. It is wholly unacceptable.

Many victims, including campaigners, invested years of voluntary effort to represent their communities and believed—especially over the last year—that they could shape the outcome. The government’s conduct has made that faith feel naïve. The entire process has become a monument to emotional labour wasted and hope abused.

We believe the conduct of those responsible for these engagement strategies should be formally investigated under civil and criminal law, including but not limited to **misconduct in public office**.



8. Failure to Respond to Urgent Correspondence

On 12 May 2025, we sent a detailed letter to Rt Hon Nick Thomas-Symonds MP, copied to James Quinault, the Inquiry, and our legal representatives. This letter:

- Requested an urgent meeting.
- Proposed a trauma-informed supplementary route.
- Raised issues of bereavement, education, mental health, inheritance tax, and the exclusion of affected estates.

On 20 May 2025, we hand-delivered a copy to Sir Keir Starmer at 10 Downing Street.

As of 23 May 2025, we have received **no reply** from either Minister or Mr Quinault. The deadline for final submissions is now upon us, and once again, we are excluded from decision-making.

Conclusion

We urge the Inquiry team with respect to:

- **Explicitly condemn** the discrimination and inequality against siblings and children and others embedded in the scheme.
- **Recommend trauma-informed, supplementary pathways** for affected people especially those who were children and have carried childhood trauma into adulthood.
- **Demand action on the inclusion of affected estates.** Though initially excluded from your recommendations, the overwhelming evidence of death, trauma, and intergenerational harm demands reconsideration.
- **Insist that future engagement be based on accountability—not optics.**

We have been excluded from justice for over four decades. Please do not let this continue in your final recommendations. We sincerely hope that whatever the



inquiry proposed in summary will not have to be repeated time and again. As we asked the Prime Minister, when will government listen to the people?

We further request the Inquiry consider whether the conduct of officials in the design and administration of this scheme may breach the **Equality Act 2010**, the **Human Rights Act 1998**, or constitute **misconduct in public office** or other misconduct.

Submitted on behalf of:

Tainted Blood – Affected Siblings and Children

Richard Newton Chair – [GRO-C] – [GRO-C] @ [GRO-C]

Owen McLaughlin – [GRO-C] – [GRO-C] @ [GRO-C]

Nicky Gregory – [GRO-C] @ [GRO-C]