

Dr Jack Gilliat
230 St Bernards Road
Solihull, West Midlands, B92 7BH

Tel 07540410023
gilliatj@doctors.org.uk

Professor Rubin
President
The General Medical Council

by email

16 September 2009

Dear Professor Rubin

I believe that the General Medical Council executive will not give you an impartial overview of the history of my complaint against Lord Professor Robert Winston. My covering letter to my 2000 complaint makes clear what I think of the GMC, as does some of my other correspondence.

Because of my doubts about the GMC Executive, I hope you will not mind me attaching a copy of only one more letter (in addition to the copy that I sent you previously of the 2004 complaint). Please bear with me in this respect. It is a key document. I originally sent this attachment to the GMC as a new complaint dated 18 October 1991 after my original complaint of June 1991 did not get past the initial screening process.

Extraordinarily, the GMC refused to consider this complaint (and the others in the following years) on the basis that the initial complaint of June 1991 had already been considered and rejected by the GMC's screener (without investigation) on 6 August 1991, and that my further complaint(s) were substantially the same as the initial complaint. Nothing could be further from the truth as is clear from the currently enclosed copy of the October 1991 complaint. My October 1991 complaint was new. It demonstrated a number of different aspects of extremely serious professional misconducts – some of which are outlined within the PS below – none of which had been presented in my initial complaint to the GMC in June 1991. Each of the misconducts, including the further case of extraordinary disparagement of Winston's letter to the TV company, were serious enough to have justified a GMC disciplinary hearing. However, the GMC failed in its duty to investigate any part of the matter at all. This failure is inexplicable. Worse still, my subsequent complaints significantly enlarged on my October 1991 complaint precisely because far more serious evidences of further gross professional misconduct came to light over the years, but these were also rejected out of hand without investigation. The end result is that the GMC has consistently refused to look into the new charges at any time despite the most outrageous misconduct that any doctor could inflict on a patient and his profession's medical code of practice. I fear this was because Robert Winston is Lord Professor Winston, the most well known doctor in the country, and a famous media figure. How precisely has the GMC – which was originally set up over 150 yrs ago to protect patients from rogue physicians, investigated the most serious of charges against this rogue and protected this patient? Incidentally you may agree that the harm to the patient is still ongoing on a day by day basis as no-one in authority has informed her that her uterus is non pathological – not Winston, nor the GMC - so Winston's misconduct and complaint can be considered correspondingly current.

This problem can be corrected and I am sure that the GMC's reputation can only be redeemed and enhanced if it seen to do the right thing now rather than damaged in some sort of cause celebre at a later date. I hope you can look into this matter as a new or ongoing complaint if only in the public interest and the continuing reputation of the GMC as I know this will be close to your heart and deep personal sense of honour and integrity.

This is the reason I am asking to see you personally.

Yours sincerely



Jack Gilliat MBA, MB, MRCP, MRCOG, DipObs
Consultant Internal Medicine, and Diabetes and Endocrinology
aka Dr Jack Glatt

PS

My October 1991 letter to the GMC documented completely new complaints as new information and misconducts had come to light. The new complaints encompassed; -

1. Disparagement and defamation of me in Winston's open letter of 29 July 1991 to a major TV company which was so shocking and outrageous, that even cursory reading of it would make it clear it had been designed with the specific aim of ruining my reputation. This letter has never been investigated by the GMC as it had reached its initial rejection decision of 6 August 1991 on the sole basis that **"doctors should be able to express general comments in the media ..."**, ie well before I had become aware of Winston's 29 July letter to the TV company as this had not been passed on to me until several weeks later. I subsequently presented this subsequent disparagement to the GMC as part of my 18 Oct 1991 complaint.
2. Winston's brazen lie in his letter to the BMJ in which he purported that he **"was in no way responsible"** for the treatment of me by the Cook Report – whereas he was directly responsible.
3. Winston also lied to the TV company and the patient regarding his diagnosis of a **"congenital uterine septum"** in order to save his own skin. You will be aware that uterine septa are always congenital as they cannot be acquired later in life. My letter of Oct 1991 explained that previous investigations had shown no evidence of a uterine septum (or any other significant pathology) and this diagnosis was therefore impossible. (Years later I discovered, and forwarded to the GMC, further evidence that none of Winston's own investigations had shown a uterine septum either.)
4. Winston was the medical advisor to the programme regarding this patient.
5. Winston had seen and approved the final version of the TV programme.
6. Winston had personally recruited the patient and asked her to appear on the TV programme after wilfully priming her with his false diagnosis. He also appeared on the programme.
7. Winston did not advise the patient of the normal complaint processes.
8. Winston had failed to make contact with me or my clinic, at any time, to seek pertinent medical details - without which it would have been impossible to properly advise the patient. I had,

in effect, been fingered by Winston without ever knowing who my secret accuser was at the time of the broadcasts. He had requested this confidentiality (see other documentation).

9. Flagrant disregard in respect of expressing a view about a colleague's professional practice contrary to the GMC's own contemporaneous Blue Book guide to gross professional misconduct.

10. Winston's false diagnosis wrecked the patient's reproductive career. I had not listed this as a specific complaint but would have been self evident.

PPS

You indicated today that you would contact me soon, as promised. In the Grand Round lecture today at Queen's Medical Centre you talked about the GMC's role in shaping future physician assessment requirements which you explained was triggered by the failure, in part, of the GMC in respect of the disastrous Bristol cardiology saga which did so much to damage the medical profession and the GMC's standing in the public eye. You were obviously moved in your own telling of the story of how the physician who was the original whistleblower in this affair had his career blighted and effectively destroyed in the process of whistleblowing, and was eventually forced to seek employment abroad in order to salvage his career. I wonder why?