

8/52

To: Ruth McEwen SOLB4

From: Dr A Rejman CA OPU2

Date: 31 July 1996

Copy: Mr K Guinness CAOPU  
with papers  
Ms C Corrigan  
Ms A Towner

*Miss Corrigan*

*1. The recent VBA meeting paper  
give the answer to the question in  
para 4 of Ruth McEwen's minute. Could  
you ask her how please.  
2. We obviously need to watch the  
same consequences of this, though X is encouraging. Ya had better call to  
D. Rejman about Y if you have  
not already done so.*

HEPATITIS C

1. Thank you for your minute of 29 July.

*2/8*

2. Although I am in CA OPU2 this has only been since August 1995. Prior to April 1995 we had parallel administrative and professional Divisions with administrators holding the formal files with professionals holding separate files. The discovery that I have produced is from my files and will contain much of what is in the official files but with additional medical/scientific papers.

3. You will recall my earlier comments that I think it wholly inappropriate and wasteful of resources for any further discovery to be undertaken until we were certain that something would come of the HCV haemophilia case. I understand from your previous minutes that we shall soon have a better idea of the view of the QC looking at hepatitis C for the plaintiffs. He will no doubt consider carefully what Mr Justice Morland had to say in the HgH/CJD judgement with respect to hindsight, as well as what information was known to the doctors treating the patients as well as the patients themselves.

X | 4. It is extremely unlikely that CAOPU2 have any further discovery in respect of the haemophiliacs. The HIV discovery specifically included hepatitis and took many months to complete. I suggested to Mr Pudlo that he should contact Mr Burrage, who has left the Department regarding the location of the missing files of original documents. I do not know whether this was done. Anyway a set of copies was sent to SOL, Counsel and several sets to the plaintiffs, including Keith Park and DMS. You will note that it is these papers that are being considered by the plaintiffs' QC.

*this was  
made by MJB  
& he didn't  
know.*

5. Ms Towner is dealing with your questions in respect of responsibilities for transfusion centres.

6. Regarding your specific questions under point 3 of your minute my replies are as follows.

i. Discovery 1989-91 primarily relates to the implementation of testing for hepatitis C and has no relevance to blood products used before that time.

ii. Discovery pre-1989 relate to nonA nonB hepatitis generally. However most of the papers are after 1985 and are not directly relevant to haemophilia.

iii. I have listed those relevant documents that I have been able to identify. It is possible that when going through my files for other reasons I may come across other documents that may be relevant. It is likely that the relevance of any such documents will be much less if their main purpose is not related to hepatitis.

iv. When do we need to start supplying our discovery list ? I do not believe it worthwhile to read every detail of each document to advise on PII until we are much further down the road.

v. I am not aware of any other departments who should be asked regarding this discovery.

vi. GEB is a heading for a series of files ( ? general blood ?). HP is Health Promotion division.

7. Mr Guinness may wish to comment about possible discussions with the NBA regarding their hepatitis cases and who should be involved on the Departmental side.

GRO-C

Dr A Rejman  
EH 420

GRO-C