

**Dr Jack Gilliat**  
**31 Bull Road**  
**London E15 3HQ**  
email [j.gilliat@virgin.net](mailto:j.gilliat@virgin.net)

Tel 07717747155

14 November 2004

Sir Graeme Catto  
President  
General Medical Council,  
St John's Building  
79 Oxford Street,  
Manchester, M1 6FQ

Dear Sir Graeme

### **Complaint of Gross Professional Misconduct against Lord Professor Robert Winston**

I am writing to you personally as I am begging you to ensure the complaint I sent to the Fitness to Practice Committee regarding Lord Professor Winston last week, is investigated properly. This is my 3<sup>rd</sup> submission in this respect.

I am extremely concerned that the General Medical Council investigation procedure dismissed my complaints against Winston on two previous occasions. The first complaint in 1991 was dismissed out of hand by the screener, so was not even investigated by the Preliminary Proceedings Committee. The screener's excuse for not investigating Winston was the claim that Winston was entitled to express "general comments in the media". However, Winston's public remarks, and a letter to the TV company several months after the Cook Report TV broadcast, contained highly malicious disparagement which should have been subject to professional misconduct investigation. Of further concern was correspondence which demonstrated the GMC did not consider other significant aspects of the complaint – each one of which would have warranted a disciplinary hearing in its own right. These other aspects had been the main thrust of my initial complaint. Winston should have been investigated with a view to striking him off the medical register. The final irony was that, despite the GMC's failure to investigate the disparagement component, Winston conceded defamation in a court case in 2000, paying me substantial damages.

The court case against Winston in 2000 revealed other aspects of gross professional misconduct which either confirmed the already substantial details of my initial complaint, or revealed further, very major, breaches of the Code of Good Medical Conduct. Again, each of these further breaches were so severe as to warrant a full disciplinary hearing in its own right. Therefore, I presented another submission to the GMC's Fitness to Practice Committee asking it to reconsider the initial complaint, and to investigate the new details. To my astonishment the second submission was dismissed out of hand with the extraordinary claim that the first investigation must have looked at the case as a whole (though correspondence shows this was not so) and "**your current complaint is substantially the same as the one you made in 1991 which was subject of a no action by the screener**". Thus the second submission was not even investigated.

At this stage please review 2 brief comments I made about the GMC in the past.

1. I wrote to the GMC on 13<sup>th</sup> Feb 2001 from the defamation aspect only, saying ;-

**"If the GMC looks at the facts of the case and refuses to investigate Lord Winston for defamation, then the GMC is an asinine, shrivelled dickhead of an organisation which fully deserves the public opprobrium that has been its lot over the past year. I understand that the Government has recently considered taking over the GMC's function precisely because it has been criticised so frequently for ineptness and for looking after the interests of the medical profession rather than that of the public. I would concur."**

2. I also wrote to the GMC in Sept 1st 2001, as follows

**“You will further recall my expressing reservations at how the GMC handled my complaint against Lord Winston in 1991. Despite the seriousness of the matter, the complaint did not pass the first hurdle of an investigation. Accordingly, I reformulated the complaint forwarding more than enough evidences to instigate an inquiry. Once again, the complaint did not pass the initial reviewer stage, and was dismissed. I was astonished – more so because of the rare instance of a physician (myself) having instigated the complaint rather than a lay member of the public. I could only conclude that Winston’s nationwide reputation was such that the GMC was not interested in pursuing the matter; alternatively, the GMC’s review process was extraordinarily incompetent and the GMC’s popular image of a brainless dinosaur whose main interest was in protecting doctors rather than investigating them, was accurate. I believe both suspicions are accurate. The GMC’s inaction was, in my opinion, an abrogation of public duty which made a mockery of the impartiality and suitability of its own procedural process. It shook my trust and confidence in the ability of the profession to properly supervise itself, and cost me dearly. I hope you will understand my wish to express feelings openly.”**

Please appreciate that these comments were made in moments of despair amongst flurries of correspondence during which I strongly suspected the GMC was doing its very best to shirk its statutory obligations. Subsequent events showed my suspicions were well founded. I greatly regret my parental upbringing inhibited me from having expressed my feelings in stronger terms, perhaps more colloquially.

The complaint presents an important and unique case involving profound implications for the public interest, patient protection, justice, blatant abuse of medical privilege, a desire by one physician to destroy the reputation of a rival in the field by cynically manipulating a vulnerable patient and ruining her reproductive career in the process, deceit, dishonesty, defamation, fraud, forgery of medical notes, concealment of patient mismanagement and results from a GP, deliberate miscommunication with colleagues, physical assaults on a patient for almost a year by deliberately subjecting Langton to unnecessary operative investigations and general anaesthetics under false pretences, destruction of patient trust, invasion of patient privacy, lying to the patient, TV company, the court and to the British Medical Journal, the proper functional due process within the GMC, etc.

The GMC’s past inaction was incomprehensible in the face of overwhelming, solid evidence of odious breaches of the code of professional conduct - some of which are headlined in the proceeding paragraph. I believe the GMC was involved in a cover-up. Proper investigations have not taken place. Why not? I believe the GMC declined to deal with the affair because of Lord Professor Winston’s very senior position, high media profile and contacts, and political connections. I suspect this mainly because this has been the instant opinion of so many professional colleagues I have spoken with. Alternatively, the GMC is utterly inept and its past failures to investigate properly are merely symptomatic of similar high profile failures in the past. This is possible in view of the GMC’s repeated public bungling over the past few years, and admitted incompetence in association with cases such as the Shipman fiasco and High Court criticism of the GMC’s conduct in the Jarman case in 2000, and the Rodney Ledward affair, for example.

The GMC is meant to protect patients. Is it doing this? Is the GMC now going to conduct a proper investigation into deliberate, multiple, flagrant, breaches of the GMC’s code of practice? I ask for a proper investigation - that is all.

I am writing to you personally, as the President of the GMC, to ask that my submission of last week is investigated properly. As in the introductory sentence of this letter, I end by saying I am begging you to ensure this.

Yours sincerely



Jack Gilliat MRCP MRCOG  
aka Jack Glatt

Enclos. Copy of 3<sup>rd</sup> submission. The enclosed copy is the definitive version – modifies previous incorrect dates and minor errors. Please replace previous version with this