Sue Stevenson

From: Jo.McGinley [redacted]
Sent: 07 October 2004 16:13
To: Sue Stevenson
Subject: FW: Death of Lucy Crawford
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

-----Original Message-----
From: Trevor Birney [redacted]
Sent: 27 September 2004 14:34
To: Jo.McGinley
Cc: roreilly[redacted]
Subject: RE: Death of Lucy Crawford

Jo,

Thank-you for your reply.

I have to point out that in the forthcoming programme we will be relying on documentary evidence, including statements made under oath, which clearly proves that the Royal did mislead the Coroner.

So far, the Royal has done nothing to address the issues or the questions raised by UTV.

In your reply you state:

The diagnosis that the doctors gave was not at variants; both were looking at the patient at different times.

> Q: Who are you referring to has having looked at the patient and at what times? How could the diagnosis be different when Lucy arrived at the Royal suffering from hyponatraemia?

Other questions which remain unanswered:

1. Why did Peter Crean tell colleagues that he had informed the coroner correctly?

2. Why did Dr. Hanrahan not tell the Coroner or the pathologist that Lucy died from hyponatraemia?

I await your reply.

Trevor.

Trevor Birney
Editor, Current Affairs
Ulster Television

-----Original Message-----
From: Jo.McGinley [mailto[redacted]
Sent: 24 September 2004 12:08
To: tbirney[redacted]
Subject: RE: Death of Lucy Crawford
Importance: High