

A.49/04/35/J Page:

248

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 February 2005 11:14
To: Heather Steen
Subject: RE: claireroberts010205

Heather,

I think in view of the importance of this case you should leave the statement long like this. It gives a clear chronologic log and shows clearly when you became involved.

I have queried a few areas in red for your consideration but apart from these I would submit it as it is.

Peter

Dr Steen,

If you need the notes to clarify any of these issues, please let me know.

Regards

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather Steen
Sent: 08 February 2005 10:06
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: claireroberts010205

Peter

I know this is far too long and needs cut but I was unsure how much detail needed to be put in. Prior to her coming, although I was her admitting consultant and would have been aware of her and the fact that Andrew Sands had asked David Webb to see her I did not actually see or examine her. Do I just need to put that she was admitted under my care was seen by the reg on call, Andrew Sands and David Webb and then go straight into the call at 0400 on the 23rd? Equally do I need to cut out Seamus and Bobs input in PICU

[REDACTED] says you will sort it for me

Could you email me back your edited version. I will however keep this one for reference as it details the whole admission

Sorry to be so useless

heather

22/2/05 - Dr Steen needs notes
 - claireroberts010205