

Witness Name: Russell Mishcon

Statement No: WITN4474009

Exhibits: None

Dated: 22 February 2021

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

SECOND WRITTEN STATEMENT OF RUSSELL MISHCON IN RESPONSE TO CRITICISM BY ROGER EVANS (W3859)

I, Russell Mishcon, will say as follows: -

I provide this statement in response to the Inquiry's letter dated 9 February 2021 notifying me of criticism made against me by Roger Evans in his Second Witness Statement (WITN3859002) to the Inquiry dated 4 February 2021.

Response to paragraph 60 of Roger Evans Second Witness Statement

1. The first sentence of paragraph 60 clearly contradicts the second sentence. It was the Board, not the NSSC, that set up the Working Party.
2. The letter to beneficiaries, to which Roger Evans refers, was drafted by me with input from members of the Working Party and the Chief Executive, Martin Harvey, and approved by the NSSC before being sent. It may also have been approved by the Board, I cannot recall, and, if so, it should be minuted.
3. It was decided, not by me, that the letter should be sent in my name, rather than in the name of the MFT Chair or the Chief Executive, presumably because I had previously communicated with beneficiaries in relation to the survey forming part of my dissertation.
4. It was always understood that there would be some recipients of the letter who would

take issue with it, but they were few. There was a huge uptake in favour of what was proposed, although I cannot recall the exact numbers.

5. At the Men Only Weekend, to which Roger Evans refers, there was only a tiny proportion of beneficiaries present at the ad hoc meeting and I was able to explain the reasoning behind what had been proposed in the letter. Interestingly, Roger Evans uses the word 'ameliorated', which I suspect he did not intend to use as it is contradictory to the words that follow. I believe that, for many at the meeting, my presence and my explanation did ameliorate the situation but a few would never be persuaded.

Response to paragraph 61 of Roger Evans Second Witness Statement

6. I take issue with Roger Evans's statement. He implies that he was an applicant for Chair in the external recruitment process, to which I have referred in paragraph 21 of my statement. I cannot recall if he was on this occasion (he had been part of a previous external recruitment process for Chair some 5 years earlier) but the Board was unwilling to make an appointment following the 2011 external recruitment process.
7. I am also not aware that he "was invited by the other Board Members to become the Chairman of the MFT", nor that the *full* (my italics) Board "unanimously supported" his appointment. I have set out in my statement (at paragraph 21) my recollection of events and, as I have indicated, I was abroad and Elizabeth Boyd had also indicated she could not be present at the Board meeting in January 2012. We both had reservations.

STATEMENT OF TRUTH

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true based on my recollections and the documents provided to me by the Inquiry.

Signed

GRO-C

Dated

22 February 2021