

Witness Name: Yvonne
Griffiths
Statement No.: 2
Exhibits: 0
Dated: 15th October 2024

THIRLWALL INQUIRY

SUPPLEMENTARY WITNESS STATEMENT OF YVONNE GRIFFITHS

I, Yvonne Griffiths, will say as follows: -

1. I make this supplementary witness statement to explain, correct and clarify passages in my first witness statement dated 19 June 2024 [INQ0102072].
2. In paragraphs 71-77 of my first witness statement [INQ0102072] I address a passage in a witness statement which I provided to the police [INQ0000531]. I have re-read my police witness statement and in particular the passage at the bottom of page 2 which states: *"I think that during 14th October 2015 Doctor Brearey may have commented to me not to give Lucy child I again for a third night. I cannot remember any specific conversation or decision in relation to this, I am just speculating regarding anything Dr Brearey said."*
3. I have also reread paragraphs 71 to 77 of my Inquiry statement and in particular paragraph 77 which addresses the above passage in my police statement.
4. As part of the evidence outline process, the Inquiry referred me to passages in the statement that Dr Brearey has provided to the Inquiry [INQ0103104]. They directed me to [174] where Dr Brearey comments on the contents of my police statement. He says that he does not remember a conversation with me on 14 October 2015 and that he may have had a conversation with me later in 2016.
5. I have considered Dr Brearey's statement together with the Neonatal Mortality Table produced by Eirian Powell [INQ0003189].
6. I accept that I was provided with the Eirian Powell's table for the purposes of responding to the Inquiry's Rule 9 request.
7. Having reviewed these two documents, I believe that I was mistaken when I said in my police statement that I had discussions with Dr Brearey about reallocating Letby away from Child I on or around 14 October 2015. I believe that this was because I was confused

about the time frame of the events concerning Letby as I had a number of discussions with Dr Brearey about Letby after she was seconded to the risk team.

8. When I prepared my statement for the Inquiry, I also did not fully understand the time frame, not appreciating that Eirian Powell's table post-dated the events of 14 October 2015. In other words, the evidence of "commonality" apparent from Eirian Powell's table was not available to me at the time of the reallocation of Letby on 14 October 2015.
9. I have reviewed the WhatsApp messages that passed between Nurse T and Letby on 14 October 2015 [INQ0000424_0059-_0061] which show that Letby was reallocated away from Child I on 14 October. On 14 October 2015, I was working a clinical shift. I am aware that there were three Band 6 nurses working that evening. I believe that it is likely that it was decided to reallocate Child I to one of the more experienced Band 6 nurses bearing in mind that Child I was in an ITU cot.
10. I have also noticed an error in paragraph 75 of my first witness statement which reads "In relation to the death of Child I, I would have been on my return to work on Monday 16th October 2015." This should have read Sunday 25th October whilst working a clinical shift. Also, the second part of the sentence should read "I would have been *informed of this* on my return to work."
11. I appreciate the importance of the declaration at the start of my police statement and of the statement of truth at the conclusion of my Inquiry statement. I apologise for my confusion concerning the time frame of events concerning Letby and for not identifying my mistake when I received the first draft of the evidence outline. I understand the importance of providing clear, accurate, and truthful information and I take responsibility for my errors.
12. Finally, I wish also to clarify the origin of an email [INQ0002879, p91], dated 15 July 2016 that I have been provided with in the second part of the evidence outline process. This email was sent from my email address on behalf of Eirian Lloyd Powell. The wording of the email was drafted by Eirian who sent it to me, asking whether, if I had time, I could forward the email in her absence as she was not back in work until Monday 18 July. I had no involvement in the wording of this email.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.