

**BRI INQUIRY****Comments of the United Bristol Healthcare NHS Trust on the  
Witness Statement of Mrs P R Shipley  
regarding her late daughter Amalie****Paragraph 50**

The Trust can understand Mrs Shipley's distress at Amalie's immediate post-operative state. It is standard practice to remove as much blood from the patients including the hair, before transfer from the Operating Theatre. However, if this has congealed hard during an 8-hour operation, it can be quite difficult to remove. It is likely that given Amalie's critical state, and the amount of equipment to which she was connected, that it was considered undesirable to move her to the degree that would be necessary to remove the traces of blood left upon her, which would naturally come off after a further period of time.

**Paragraph 63**

The Trust much regrets that the letter from the Chief Executive dated 28 February 1999, although factually correct, in that the Trust did not then have in its possession any tissues or organs, gave Mrs Shipley the false impression that organs had never been retained.

In January 1999 many queries were being received about the retention of organs and it was only possible at that time, in many cases, to state whether organs were still kept or not. Later further research of historical records in the Pathology Laboratory revealed in Amalie's case that organs had initially been kept but then subsequently disposed of (Ian Barrington's letter of 23 February 1999).

There was no intention to mislead Mrs Shipley in Mr Ross' first letter and it is most unfortunate that she felt the reply to her letter of 5 January 1999 was misleading. In part, this is due to the different meanings understood in different contexts of the word "retained", in addition to the available information at the time which only enabled the Trust to say whether it still had organs or tissue, or not.

H:\Word\sey\ubt001-jea98005\Trust Comments - ws of Mrs Phillipa R Shipley

10 February 2000