

**From:** Tom Beezer <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Andrew Parsons <[REDACTED]>, "Gideon Cohen" <[REDACTED]>, "David Cavender" <[REDACTED]>, "Stephanie Wood" <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Amy Prime <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: recusal [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]  
**Date:** Wed, 20 Mar 2019 08:05:54 +0000  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Inline-Images:** image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; imaged31ef1.PNG; imagee484f2.PNG; imageaccd11.PNG

---

Also...

Info...Jane says that for the 11.45 call with Lord Grabiner the Board of POL has asked for "*independent legal advice*" so a "*non-litigation*" partner from Norton Rose will be dialling in. Don't know who.

Gideon, David – you may want to make Lord Grabiner aware, although I don't expect that to worry him one jot as he was quite emphatic as to where the Board's duty lay.

This e mail is just info...just found the above out.

t

**Tom Beezer**  
Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [REDACTED]  
m: [REDACTED]  
t: [REDACTED]  
e: [REDACTED]

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

**Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0**  
**20 March 2019 at the British Library**

**Book your place [here](#)**



womblebonddickinson.com



**From:** Tom Beezer  
**Sent:** 20 March 2019 08:00  
**To:** Andrew Parsons; Gideon Cohen ([REDACTED]); David Cavender ([REDACTED]); Stephanie Wood ([REDACTED])  
**Cc:** Amy Prime  
**Subject:** RE: recusal [WBODUK-AC.FID26896945]

I don't disagree...but I was asked to ask the Q...so I did...

We need answers that I can collate into a narrative back to POL.

Shorter the better...

Thanks all...

---

**From:** Andrew Parsons  
**Sent:** 20 March 2019 07:58  
**To:** Tom Beezer; Gideon Cohen ([REDACTED]); David Cavender ([REDACTED]); Stephanie Wood ([REDACTED])  
**Cc:** Amy Prime  
**Subject:** RE: recusal

Point 2 is logically wrong. The procedural unfairness for trial 1 does not automatically infect trial 2 with procedural unfairness, because the procedure for both trials was different. The cross-infection is due to the Judge's bias.

Also, there is zero chance of this judge staying the Horizon trial in any event, and without a recusal application on the cards, I cannot see the C of A moving quick enough to stay the Horizon trial on normal appeal grounds.

This plan will almost certainly fail, will just waste time and make PO look indifferent to recusal when it needs to move forcefully.

Just my two cents...

A

**Andrew Parsons**  
Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [REDACTED]

m:  
t:  
e:

**GRO**

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

**Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0**  
**20 March 2019 at the British Library**

**Book your place [here](#)**



[womblebond Dickinson.com](http://womblebond Dickinson.com)



---

**From:** Tom Beezer  
**Sent:** 20 March 2019 07:44  
**To:** Gideon Cohen (gcoher@GRO); David Cavender (dcavender@GRO); Stephanie Wood (swood@GRO)  
**Cc:** Amy Prime; Andrew Parsons  
**Subject:** FW: recusal [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

All

The client asks the question below. Views ?

**Tom Beezer**  
Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:  
m:  
t:  
e:

**GRO**

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

**Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0**  
**20 March 2019 at the British Library**

**Book your place [here](#)**



[womblebond Dickinson.com](http://womblebond Dickinson.com)



---

**From:** Jane MacLeod [mailto:GRO]  
**Sent:** 20 March 2019 07:14  
**To:** Tom Beezer  
**Cc:** Andrew Parsons; Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** recusal

Tom

I have been asked to see whether an approach along the following lines (as an alternative to recusal) would be possible procedurally:

- "1. inform the judge that the company is appealing on the law and unfair procedure
2. ask the judge to stop the Horizon trial until the outcome of the appeal is determined on the grounds that if the unfairness claim is upheld it would also put the fairness of the Horizon trial at risk
3. If the judge refuses 2, seek and order from a higher court to the same effect and ask the judge at least to stop the Horizon trial until such an order can be obtained (or not)

If the remedy in 3 is sought but isn't obtained we will at least have tested the relevance and implications of unfairness issues on the second trial. And effectively a higher court will have told us that any unfairness in the first trial would not impact the Horizon trial (obviously contrary to POL's view).

If the remedy in 3 doesn't exist in law then recusal would be an alternative at that point. It seems to me the judge's refusal to agree to 2 would support a recusal application as he would be unwilling to accept that if unfairness took place in the first trial the nature of it would necessarily affect the conduct and fairness of the Horizon trial - a view which logically suggests bias as it is absurd."

Could we please test this with the Counsel team? It may have the outcome that the judge is asked to recuse himself, but not necessarily. And seems to assume that we could get an appeal quite quickly, which must be uncertain. I'm also not sure that the logic in 2. holds up, and 3 means arguing procedural unfairness without (necessarily) arguing mis-application of the law etc.

Thanks,

Jane