

Witness Name: Kenneth Gray

Statement No: WITN0491006

Dated: 14 December 2020

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KENNETH GRAY IN RESPONSE TO THE STATEMENT OF DR JOHN KEITH RAMAGE

I, Kenneth Gray, will say as follows: -

Section 1. Introduction

1. I have already made two previous statements to the Inquiry, on 9 November 2018 and 14 December 2020.
2. I have read the written statement made by Dr John Keith Ramage dated 18 September 2020 in relation to my wife's treatment under the Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust (WITN4134014), which was given in response to my statement of 9 November 2018.
3. I understand that the Inquiry had initially contacted a Doctor Ramage who denied treating my wife or working at Hampshire Hospitals Foundation Trust. I have now seen Dr Ramage's statement of 18 September 2020 and I am satisfied that he is the Doctor who treated my wife.

4. Further to my previous statements, I would like to provide a response to the statement made by Dr Ramage.
5. On my first reading of Dr Ramage's statement, his responses made it seem as though he had done an excellent job in treating my wife. However, after reading the statement in more detail I have realised that there are many contradictions within it.
6. Each section of this statement will be a response to claims made by Dr Ramage in specific paragraphs within his statement.

Section 2. Responses to claims made in Dr Ramage's statement

Paragraphs 3 & 4

7. In paragraph 3 Doctor Ramage refers to the discharge summary from 23 March 2003 which details the sphincterotomy performed on my wife to relieve her right upper quadrant pain and says that 'there was no reason to suppose that she might be infected with hepatitis C at that time'. At paragraph 4 he states that the surgical team, who she was referred to when her pain continued, 'thought that she may have chronic pancreatitis'.
8. In my opinion, it appears that Dr Ramage's arrogance caused him to concentrate on what he calls the 'spasm of the sphincter of Oddi' in paragraph 4 of his statement, that he overlooked any other possible explanations for her pain resulting in a misdiagnosis and an unnecessary procedure (the sphincterotomy) which caused her a lot of problems later on, including her treatment for Hepatitis C being delayed.

Paragraph 5

9. In paragraph 5 Dr Ramage claims that his registrar, Dr Pearce, referred my wife to Dr Pereira at University College Hospital in London. This statement is incorrect. She was referred to Doctor Pereira by our GP, after my wife and I attended our GP surgery on 27/06/2003 and asked for a second opinion as we were getting nowhere with Dr Ramage.

Paragraph 6

10. In paragraph 6 Dr Ramage states that he saw my wife on 7 November 2003 and noted that 'some of her symptoms were undoubtedly due to Hepatitis C although I thought it was unlikely that all the symptoms were due to that'. This was after my wife was diagnosed with Hepatitis C by University College Hospital. Prior to her diagnosis my wife's symptoms had not changed, Dr Ramage was aware of these, why in that case does he say some of her symptoms were undoubtedly due to Hepatitis C. If he is saying that why didn't he diagnose earlier?

Paragraph 12

11. Dr Ramage says that in the discharge summary of 10 May 2004 it was noted that after SG was admitted to hospital with epigastric pain 'there was no suggestion of pancreatitis'. I would like to know why my wife was given a liquid diet when there was no evidence of pancreatitis. She was on this diet for three months.

Paragraph 13

12. Dr Ramage says at paragraph 13 that he agreed to supply my wife with a further 3 months of treatment in a letter dated 15 July 2004 to our GP. Irrespective of this, my gut feeling is that the funding was always an issue and Dr Ramage did not want the outlay, which is why we had to fight to get him to offer the further 3 months.

13. In addition to this, I would like to clarify that we decided not to take the offer of an extra 3 months treatment as there had been a gap of 3 months and it would be like starting the treatment from scratch again.

Paragraph 15

14. At paragraph 15 Dr Ramage states that in a letter dated 14 February 2005 from Dr Brooks, Dr Brooks states that my wife was booked into her clinic in January or February 2005 and had not attended. Doctor Ramage says that he had 'received information that she was being seen by Dr Naoumov who was a hepatitis specialist at University College' and 'in view of this a further appointment was not booked at Hampshire Hospitals'. I would like to confirm that this was the case, my wife was seeing Dr Naoumov.

Paragraph 16

15. Doctor Ramage states that they 'were testing for Hepatitis C' at the time he was seeing my wife and for 'many years previously'. He states that 'her original complaint was pain with a dilated bile duct, and that this was an unusual presenting symptom of Hepatitis C'.
16. He appears to be suggesting that these symptoms were not linked to Hepatitis C. However, he contradicts this at paragraph 6 where he says that 'some of her symptoms were undoubtedly due to Hepatitis C'. My opinion is that he failed to see the link between my wife's symptom of right upper quadrant pain and he should have tested her for Hepatitis C in light of her presenting with this symptom. As I have stated previously, I believe that his failure to test and diagnose her resulted in a delay in her receiving treatment.

Paragraphs 17, 18 & 19

17. At paragraph 18 Dr Ramage states that he does not recall saying 'we don't expect this sort of thing in Hampshire' in relation to my wife's Hepatitis C diagnosis. I was at the appointment with my wife when Dr Ramage made this comment and I am certain that he definitely said this. If we were in Court I would look him in the eye and challenge him regarding this.

18. My opinion is that he made this comment as he was annoyed that we had sought a second opinion and that a diagnosis was made as a result of this second opinion, which he was unable to do. I think that he saw it as offensive to his sense of his professionalism.

19. I also believe that the comment shows that his predisposed idea that Hepatitis C did not exist in Hampshire blinded him to other explanations for my wife's symptoms and resulted in him failing to test my wife, which ultimately contributed to misdiagnosing her condition and a delay in her receiving treatment.

20. I have no animosity toward Dr Ramage as he was in the early stages of his career as a Gastroenterologist at that point in time, however he did get my wife's diagnosis wrong.

21. At paragraph 19 Dr Ramage suggests that my wife may have been upset about his bedside manner, as he was direct in telling her the treatment had to be stopped. This was not the case. My wife disliked Dr Ramage and complained about his bedside manner from the very first consultation we had with him. We both found him to have an arrogant attitude and this only got worse after her diagnosis.

22. Dr Ramage states at paragraph 19 that he was 'sorry to be made aware of this now as that was not, and never would have been my

intention' If at any point Dr Ramage had apologised at the time, we would have accepted his misdiagnosis and I may not be making this statement.

23. At paragraph 18 Dr Ramage says that he is 'not sure that I was aware at the time that she had previously had a blood transfusion at Frimley Park Hospital'. To me, this shows that he has not read my wife's medical notes properly, which were substantial in size. He should have been aware of this, as it would have been in my wife's medical notes. If he read the notes he would have been able to link the 1979 transfusion to her pain and he could have made an earlier diagnosis.

24. I note that in paragraph 2 of Dr Ramage's statement he refers to the fact that hard copy medical notes have been 'misfiled by a storage company'. This was the reason why the Skipton Fund refused to accept my wife's claim, as there was no record of the blood transfusion she received in 1979. I find Dr Ramage's reference to the documents being 'misfiled' very suspicious.

Statement of Truth

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

Signed GRO-C

Dated 14.12.20