POL00209785

From: Belinda Crowe[IMCEAEX-_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=BELINDA+20CROWE79B93F11-569F-4526-A078-F5B4958A8917220@C72A47.ingest.local]

Sent: Fri 26/09/2014 7:13:28 AM (UTC)

To: Chris Aujard GRO

Cc: Belinda Crowe GRO

Subject: FW: 2nd Sight TOR

Not sure whether I ever showed you this but it is the genesis for having allowed criminal cases into the Scheme.

Belinda Crowe
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ
GRO 8 Postline: GRO
GRO

-----Original Message-----
From: Alice Perkins GRO
Sent: 09 June 2012 09:36
To: Susan Crichton
Cc: Paula Vennells; Alwen Lyons
Subject: 2nd Sight TOR

Following a conversation with Alwen yesterday, and given that I am away now for a few days, I thought I should let you know before I went where I stand on which cases should be in or out of this review.
I have given this more thought since yesterday.
I am clear that we should include ALL the MPs' cases, irrespective of whether they have been decided in Court. If we try to draw a distinction here we will be accused of picking cases to suit ourselves and being vulnerable on the ones we omit. We'll have a row about that instead of moving the issue on.
On reflection, I don't buy the argument that we would somehow undermine the Court process by doing this. There are plenty of ways in which people go over ground which has been settled in Court and if there weren't, no-one would ever be able to get a conviction overturned. And if (which we don't believe) there were new evidence in a case which had been decided, we would want to do, and be seen to do, the right thing by that.
So I stick by the TOR as drafted yesterday on this important point.
Where I think there may be an issue is the line between Shoesmith's cases which have been declared to us and those (many more) which they have merely hinted at. I suggest the way to deal with those may be by time, ie we'll include those we know about as of Monday week but not those which come after. As we said at our meeting, it would be open to the independent reviewers to say in their findings that they think we should extend the review.
I am sorry to be bothering you with this on a Saturday but time is against us, especially as Paula is seeing James Arbuthnot on Monday afternoon and I feel very strongly about this.
I am around this morning packing etc if you want to talk to me and of course, if necessary, you can raise me while I'm away.
Thank you
Alice