

Message

From: Melanie Corfield [/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MELANIE CORFI1DE623C2-38B2-49FB-AE9A-12E4B20D626720C]
Sent: 11/03/2015 16:52:03
To: Mark R Davies; [REDACTED] GRO
Subject: RE: James Arbuthnot

Thanks!

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 11 March 2015 16:47
To: Melanie Corfield
Subject: Re: James Arbuthnot

I suggest we say - we have made the position clear in our report and in our statement. We have published very detailed update. It is regrettable that a misleading impression is being created.

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO

Sent from my iPhone

On 11 Mar 2015, at 16:44, "Melanie Corfield" [REDACTED] GRO wrote:

Inevitably R5Live are asking, on the back of our statement – are we saying Mr Arbuthnot is wrong? Since he's standing down I am tempted to just go back with "yes" but I guess that's unacceptable! Also it's semantics re the word "sacking"

I was going to say: "Mr Arbuthnot's question could create a very inaccurate impression because we are not suppressing Second Sight's report or destroying documents" or something like that.

Would appreciate advice re how far to go (although we need to stay measured to avoid a story on PO calling him a liar!)

Thanks

Mel Corfield
Communications Team
1st Floor – Old Street
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO