

Witness Name: **GRO-B**

WITN7756002

Exhibits: WITN7756003-005

Dated: 22 April 2025

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

SECOND WRITTEN STATEMENT OF **GRO-B**

I provide this statement in response to the Second written statement of James Quinault dated 3 April 2025.

I, **GRO-B**, will say as follows:

1. I refer to the second witness statement of James Quinault 3rd April 2025 from Para 96 to 101. He responds to the Inquiry's question (noting para 31 of my witness statement WITN7756001) about paying interest to those whose claims are paid later to reflect the delay and its impact on the value of the compensation. James Quinault says the government did not apply the Personal Injury Discount Rate ("PIDR") to the awards and for that reason will not be paying interest to those whose claims are paid later.
2. The issue of PIDR is irrelevant to the issue in question. The only way it would be relevant would be if everyone were paid on the same day. If two claimants were due to receive identical awards, the claimant who had a claim paid earlier, who did not have PIDR deducted will still be better off than a claimant paid later who also did not have PIDR deducted. The issue of PIDR makes no difference to the discrepancy between the two awards and the unfairness that results. The

claimant paid later could in some circumstances be many thousands of pounds worse off than a claimant paid earlier.

3. The issue of the PIDR refers to the issue of compensation being paid on the whole claim and not the question the Inquiry asked. I am further concerned James Quinault must surely understand this is irrelevant yet still advanced it as an answer. I believe this to be the case for the following reasons.
4. On 14 January 2025 I emailed the IBI Response Team at the Cabinet Office and requested that the email be passed to Mr Quinault and Nick Thomas-Symonds before the engagement meetings due to take place on 17 January. In that email I set out, inter alia, that:

“Interest needs to be added to claims paid later to make up for the loss of investment income, possibly amounting to £90,000 over three years for those paid last. Also inflation will reduce the value of the core tariffs. Those paid in the first year will have the opportunity to invest their compensation, those paid in subsequent years will lose that benefit. Those paid last will be significantly disadvantaged. The interest referred to is interest to be paid from the date the first claimants receive their payments to offset the delay in receiving the payment”. [WITN7756003]

5. It is clear in my email that I am asking about the payment of interest in connection with claims paid after December 2024, possibly as much as 3 years later, which we now know is very likely to happen. The interest should be paid on any payment paid after the first one was made in December 2024.
6. The Cabinet Office has advanced several reasons for not paying the interest in question. Ranging from ‘*IBCA aim to pay everyone as quickly as possible*’ to stating that to pay this interest would be “*disproportionately complex*” [WITN7756004]. I have exchanged several emails on this subject including one with figures to demonstrate that it is not complex [WITN7756005].
7. On 2nd April 2025, I again raised this matter in a meeting with James Quinault attended by other campaigners. A fellow campaigner worked out a calculation in a matter of minutes to demonstrate to James Quinault that the calculation required was not complex. James Quinault then sought to rely on another

justification for not paying the interest, namely that as the scheme was up and running, to start paying this interest would slow payments down. I suggested they might carry on as before and then go back later and pay the interest. Each time a reason for not paying the interest is advanced and defended, the Cabinet Office advances a different reason.

8. This issue has been raised on so many occasions that it is perfectly clear, the matter referred to is the issue of interest to be paid on awards paid later to account for the delay and loss of investment opportunity and therefore the issue of PIDR is irrelevant.
9. I believe James Quinault to be a man of at least average intelligence and it is inconceivable that he could have misunderstood this. James Quinault says *"taken as a whole this is fair"* but this isn't strictly part of that 'whole', it is an attempt to mitigate some of the manifest financial unfairness that will result from the glacial pace at which the scheme is being delivered and as such the interest in issue should be paid.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed

GRO-B

Dated 29 April 2025

Table of exhibits:

Date	Notes/ Description	Exhibit number
14/01/2025	Email to James Quinault and Nick	WITN7756003

	Thomas-Symonds	
29/01/2025	Email from IBI Response at Cabinet Office	WITN7756004
29/01/2025	Email to Hannah Smallwood with comments in red	WITN7756005