

Witness Name: Jason Jonathan Evans

Statement No: WITN1210008

Exhibits: WITN1210009-036

Dated: February 2020

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

EXHIBIT WITN1210024



Jason Evans <jasonjonevans@GRO-C>

Contaminated Blood Documents - Ministerial Line

4 messages

Jason Evans <jasonjonevans@GRO-C> 1 March 2018 at 09:30
To: Lynne Featherstone <lynne@GRO-C>

Dear Lynne,

I hope you are doing well? I was wondering what we might be able to do in terms of getting a stop put to / overturn the below line by Ministers? I think this is important as they may attempt to use a similar line when the Inquiry requests evidence of DH.

Ministers took the line that "All documents up to 1995 are available through the National Archive."

Sources:

<https://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2017-02-27.65851.h&s=documents+penrose#g65851.q0> (7th March 2017)

<https://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2017-02-27.65849.h&s=documents+penrose#g65849.q0> (7th March 2017)

Through a process of identifying the original DH reference numbers for files and cross-referencing I was able to determine that many files were in fact not at the archives and I was able to identify exactly what is missing (this work is on-going). However, I feel I have reached a point where it can be demonstrated without doubt that the line the Government took was untrue, I include examples below...

a) Firstly, in the CBL 8 series of files which concerns the Central Blood Laboratories Authority (this series relates strongly to BPL etc) I identified at least 3 packs were not at the archives that should have been. In a response from DH to one of my FOI requests dated 9th October 2017 this was found to be proven true and DH subsequently agreed to release those 3 packs to the archive, though still they are not available. https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/430716/response/1050447/attach/2/FOI%201097610%20reply%20Evans.pdf?cookie_passthrough=1

b) Next, in the HIM 22 series of files which contains a variety of evidence relating to Hepatitis C and blood safety... I identified at least 3 packs which were missing, 2 of which have now been made available as a result but 1 of those packs (HIM 22 VOL 8) is as yet still not available. In a reply I received from DH on 28th February 2018 they said "HIM/022/007/V008 was not requested by the Penrose Inquiry, and therefore will be sensitivity reviewed, redacted and transferred into the relevant series for blood related subjects by the end of the year". https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/him_22_series_of_files_2#incoming-1119962

In my experience of dealing with these packs, each pack generally contains anywhere from 200 - 400 pages, so these 4 outstanding packs alone are likely to be in the region of 1,000 individual pages of evidence.

I currently have a raft of outstanding FOI requests in which a wide-range of further missing packs are identified to which I am awaiting response from DH, but I believe the above alone demonstrates clearly that the previous Ministerial statements that "All documents up to 1995 are available through the National Archive" was plainly not true. Had it not been for this cross-referencing exercise I think it's safe to say there was no intention by DH to make these available.

Is there anything we can do to get them to withdraw this line and discontinue its use? Do feel free to give me a call if I can help to clarify any of the above. Many Thanks,

--
Best Regards,
Jason Evans
GRO-C

Disclaimer: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@[REDACTED] GRO-C >
To: jasonjonevans@[REDACTED] GRO-C

1 March 2018 at 09:30



Message not delivered

Your message couldn't be delivered to **lynne@[REDACTED] GRO-C** because the remote server is misconfigured. See technical details below for more information.

The response from the remote server was:

554 5.7.1 <lynne@[REDACTED] GRO-C >: Relay access denied

Final-Recipient: rfc822; lynne@[REDACTED] GRO-C
Action: failed
Status: 5.7.1
Remote-MTA: dns; smtp-fwd.wordpress.com. (192.0.97.133, the server for the domain lynnefeatherstone.org.)
Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 554 5.7.1 <lynne@[REDACTED] GRO-C >: Relay access denied
Last-Attempt-Date: Thu, 01 Mar 2018 01:30:49 -0800 (PST)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jason Evans <jasonjonevans@[REDACTED] GRO-C >
To: Lynne Featherstone <lynne@[REDACTED] GRO-C >
Cc:
Bcc:
Date: Thu, 1 Mar 2018 09:30:47 +0000
Subject: Contaminated Blood Documents - Ministerial Line
Dear Lynne,

I hope you are doing well? I was wondering what we might be able to do in terms of getting a stop put to / overturn the below line by Ministers? I think this is important as they may attempt to use a similar line when the Inquiry requests evidence of DH.

Ministers took the line that "All documents up to 1995 are available through the National Archive."

Sources:

<https://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2017-02-27.65851.h&s=documents+penrose#g65851.q0>
<<http://s.bl-1.com/h/cb8dkwoo?url=https://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2017-02-27.65851.h&s=documents+penrose#g65851.q0>>

(7th
March 2017)

<https://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2017-02-27.65849.h&s=documents+penrose#g65849.q0>
<<http://s.bl-1.com/h/cb8dk0Bq?url=https://www.theyworkforyou.com/wrans/?id=2017-02-27.65849.h&s=documents+penrose#g65849.q0>>

(7th March 2017)

Through a process of identifying the original DH reference numbers for files and cross-referencing I was able to determine that many files were in fact not at the archives and I was able to identify exactly what is missing (this work is on-going). However, I feel I have reached a point where it can be demonstrated without doubt that the line the Government took was untrue, I include examples below...

a) Firstly, in the CBL 8 series of files which concerns the Central Blood Laboratories Authority (this series relates strongly to BPL etc) I identified at least 3 packs were not at the archives that should have been. In a response from DH to one of my FOI requests dated 9th October 2017 this was found to be proven true and DH subsequently agreed to release those 3 packs to the archive, though still they are not available.
https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/430716/response/1050447/attach/2/FOI%201097610%20reply%20Evans.pdf?cookie_passthrough=1
<http://s.bl-1.com/h/cb8dk5bs?url=https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/430716/response/1050447/attach/2/FOI%201097610%20reply%20Evans.pdf?cookie_passthrough=1>

b) Next, in the HIM 22 series of files which contains a variety of evidence relating to Hepatitis C and blood safety... I identified at least 3 packs which were missing, 2 of which have now been made available as a result but 1 of those packs (HIM 22 VOL 8) is as yet still not available. In a reply I received from DH on 28th February 2018 they said "HIM/022/007/V008 was not requested by the Penrose Inquiry, and therefore will be sensitivity reviewed, redacted and transferred into the relevant series for blood related subjects by the end of the year".
https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/him_22_series_of_files_2#incoming-1119962
<http://s.bl-1.com/h/cb8dk9zv?url=https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/him_22_series_of_files_2#incoming-1119962>

In my experience of dealing with these packs, each pack generally contains anywhere from 200 - 400 pages, so these 4 outstanding packs alone are likely to be in the region of 1,000 individual pages of evidence.

I currently have a raft of outstanding FOI requests in which a wide-range of further missing packs are identified to which I am awaiting response from DH, but I believe the above alone demonstrates clearly that the previous Ministerial statements that "All documents up to 1995 are available through the National Archive" was plainly not true. Had it not been for this cross-referencing exercise I think it's safe to say there was no intention by DH to make these available.

Is there anything we can do to get them to withdraw this line and discontinue its use? Do feel free to give me a call if I can help to clarify any of the above. Many Thanks,

--

Best Regards,

Jason Evans

{ GRO-C }

Disclaimer: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only

----- Message truncated -----

Jason Evans <jasonjonevans@{ GRO-C }>
To: featherstonel@{ GRO-C }>
Cc: Lynne Kelly <lynne.kelly@{ GRO-C }>

1 March 2018 at 09:39

[Quoted text hidden]

FEATHERSTONE, Baroness <featherstonel@{ GRO-C }>
To: Jason Evans <jasonjonevans@{ GRO-C }>

1 March 2018 at 15:48

Cc: "lynne.kelly@GRO-C" <lynne.kelly@GRO-C >

Hi Jason

Will have a think over weekend and get back to you

Best
Lynne

Ps by the way - fantastic work finding that info!

From: Jason Evans <jasonjonevans@GRO-C >

Sent: Thursday, March 1, 2018 9:39:43 AM

To: FEATHERSTONE, Baroness

Cc: Lynne Kelly

Subject: Fwd: Contaminated Blood Documents - Ministerial Line

[Quoted text hidden]

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.