

Message

**From:** Paula Vennells [REDACTED] **GRO**  
**on behalf of** Paula Vennells [REDACTED] **GRO**  
**Sent:** 09/06/2012 08:51:50  
**To:** Alice Perkins [REDACTED] **GRO**  
**CC:** Susan Crichton [REDACTED] **GRO**; Alwen Lyons [REDACTED] **GRO**  
**Subject:** Re: 2nd Sight TOR

Alice, if Susan doesn't get back to you, I'm around so call me on the mobile. I wasn't party to this part of the discussion as it was when I was in the Eagle meeting. But we can talk and I can pick up with Susan on Monday.

Call when it suits. Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Jun 2012, at 09:36, "Alice Perkins" [REDACTED] **GRO** wrote:

> 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  
>  
> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

\*\*\*\*\*  
This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender and then delete this email from your system.

ROYAL MAIL GROUP LIMITED registered in England and Wales at 100 VICTORIA EMBANKMENT, LONDON EC4Y 0HQ with the registered company number 04138203

POST OFFICE LIMITED registered in England and Wales at 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ with the registered company number 02154540