

From: Gregory Murphy [REDACTED]

Subject: Concerning Mrs Maureen Murphy: W07787

Date: 21 June 2018 at 12:47:19

To: nhsbsa [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern:

Complaint regarding the treatment experienced in contact with EIBSS today (June 21st, 2018);

I write on behalf of my mother, Mrs Maureen Murphy (dob. [GRO-C]1938) a bereaved widow (since September 3rd, 1994) of a Hepatitis C and B infected haemophiliac, Mr William Murphy, (my father) who died after being treated with contaminated NHS blood products administered to him in the 1970s and 1980s.

Before continuing, I wish to make it clear that this complaint **is not** about the two call-handlers with whom I have dealt with this morning, whose hands were clearly tied, whose options of response were naturally limited, and who maintained courtesy, sensitivity and professionalism throughout the duration of the two telephone exchanges.

The substance of the matter is that:

My mother, who has been repeatedly discriminated against over the last three decades on the basis that my father contracted and died from Hepatitis C and B related complexities and not those of HIV, to the point where she currently receives no ongoing support from the various schemes established over the years, beyond her annual heating allowance, seems likely to be excluded again from the reviewed schemes of payment.

At least, that is, according to the EIBSS website which lays out three criteria that she must meet:

Vis: (from the EIBSS website):

Partners of a deceased beneficiary/check if you're eligible:

You will not qualify for payment if:

- ***you were divorced, your civil partnership had been dissolved, or you were separated at the time***
- ***your spouse or civil partner died before they registered with us, or any of the previous schemes***

My father died in 1994. Given that he had not been infected with HIV he could not qualify for payments under the Macfarlane Trust. Further, given that neither of the Skipton or Caxton schemes were established in 1994, he could not possibly have registered with either of those either prior to his death. Therefore, judging from the above cited criteria on the EIBSS website, my mother would clearly not qualify for support and she should not have been sent the literature that has been dispatched to her this morning which raised her hopes of finally, aged 80, having been widowed since she was 56, being able to have a more secure future.

That literature, had advised us to go online to the EIBSS website in accordance with the Discretionary Support guidance booklet (Pg 10) which refers to the need to download an application form from the site.

Upon accessing the site, however, we read the above criteria and realised that my mother would shockingly be excluded yet again from any kind of justice.

However, the information given above not only contradicts what was given in the printed booklet sent to my mother this morning but also that included in a further section of the EIBSS website.

Under the web-heading "Discretionary Support Available" (sub-section "Who Can Apply?") the EIBSS site clearly states:

To be eligible to apply for an income top-up payment, the applicant must be registered with EIBSS. Everyone registered with EIBSS holds a unique reference number and will be:

- ***someone historically infected with HIV and / or hepatitis C from NHS blood or blood products***
- ***a bereaved spouse, civil or long-term partner who lived with an infected beneficiary***

My mother quite clearly fits this category. Not only is the information given immediately above included on the EIBSS website but the exact same criteria is listed in the Guidance Booklet delivered this morning.

Therefore, in a highly distressed state – and I cannot stress enough how little my mother needs the ongoing distress of having to deal with the financial aspects of support (or not as the case may be) concerning the national scandal that befell my father and thousands of others – we had no choice but to contact the EIBSS this morning seeking clarity.

On presenting our query to the first call-handler, it was clear that the lady understood our issue and was unable to provide a definitive response one way or the other as to whether my mother would qualify for payment; simply because the given criteria contradicts itself. We were told to await a call-back later today.

After a 90 minute gap – an hour and a half of complete distress for my mother, who has had her hopes raised and then dashed yet again this morning, and then being left in a prolonged limbo – I decided to call back for an update.

I have been informed in the last hour that the matter has been referred to the Department of Health (an organisation that my family has absolutely zero faith in and that is totally responsible for the distress that my mother has experienced over three decades in any case).

Therefore it is clear to us that no-one at EIBSS could put my mother out of her misery and that we were right to point out the discrepancy.

We have been advised that we will get a call back today, presumably on the advice of the DOH.

Well, we've been on the receiving end of the DOH's failed promises for a very long

time now and have no confidence that such a call will be forthcoming.

Regardless, that my mother should have to wait even one minute for clarification on this matter – 24 years after my father’s death – let alone a wait that is now getting on for two hours and likely to be the rest of the day, at best, is yet another scandal.

I cannot tell you how heartbroken she is right at this moment, at the very thought that she is once again going to be excluded and discriminated against.

I would like to hear what your thoughts are about this latest shocking treatment of an elderly lady who has already suffered considerable distress for several decades.

Yours sincerely,

Mr G Murphy
on behalf of Mrs Maureen Murphy