

## SPSO decision report

**Case:** 201806587, Highland NHS Board  
**Sector:** Health  
**Subject:** appointments / admissions (delay / cancellation / waiting lists)  
**Decision:** not upheld, no recommendations

### Summary

Miss C, an advocate, complained on behalf of her client (Ms A) that the board had decided, from an urology (the branch of medicine and physiology concerned with the function and disorders of the urinary track) perspective, there was no reason to refer Ms A for an immunology (the branch of medicine and biology concerned with immunity) opinion.

We took independent advice from a consultant urologist. We found that the care and treatment given to Ms A was reasonable, and that appropriate advice had been given in relation to her condition. We also found that Ms A had not completed the investigations necessary to diagnose her condition and that, in these circumstances and from an urology perspective, there was no reason to refer Ms A for an immunology opinion. Therefore, we did not uphold Miss C's complaint.