

From: Andrew Parsons [GRO]
To: Tom Beezer [GRO], David Cavender [GRO]
Gideon Cohen [GRO], Owain Draper [GRO]
Cc: Amy Prime [GRO]
Subject: RE: Grounds of Appeal against CIT
Date: Fri, 22 Mar 2019 10:27:00 +0000
Importance: Normal
Inline-Images: image002.png; image003.png; image004.png; image005.jpg; image69db75.PNG;
image7d92ab.PNG; image035a02.PNG

David

I agree with getting the appeal out sooner rather than later, but accept that this is a balance between speed and quality.

Can we also consider again whether we should admit implied terms (a) and (b) – perhaps in modified form? I get that we have technical arguments for contesting these points, but opposing them does give a bad impression.

A

Andrew Parsons
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



From: Tom Beezer
Sent: 21 March 2019 13:27
To: David Cavender; Andrew Parsons; Gideon Cohen; Owain Draper
Cc: Amy Prime
Subject: RE: Grounds of Appeal against CIT [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

David

Good points.

I'll get the necessary people thinking !

t

Tom Beezer

Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: 
m: **GRO**
t: 
e: 

[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: David Cavender [mailto: **GRO**]
Sent: 21 March 2019 13:19
To: Tom Beezer; Andrew Parsons; Gideon Cohen; Owain Draper
Cc: Amy Prime
Subject: Grounds of Appeal against CIT

Dear Tom,

I have seen you recent email to the clerks regarding future actions.

One future action that has not been mentioned - that I have been quietly working on, is the grounds of appeal against the CIT – which is quite a task given how much he has got wrong !

Although we have until after the time scheduled for the Horizon trial to apply to the Court of Appeal for permission, my sense is that it would be extremely useful to have an early draft of the (main) grounds of appeal to show the Court of Appeal on the appeal against refusal of the recusal – as it will be helpful so we can explain to them the nature and extent of the intended appeal against CIT.

My thinking is as follows. Faced with a recusal application the Court of Appeal may be concerned not to rubbish the whole of the completed (and expensive) CIT process (Horizon trial will already be undermined). If they can be assured (assisted by a draft grounds of appeal) that we would *not* be seeking a retrial – but a significant re-write of the CIT judgment- they may be less hostile. A draft grounds of appeal would show:

-) That the appeal is mainly on points of law.
-) That certain of the irrelevant findings of fact/observations are sought to be quashed – very unusual but possible.
-) That the appeal on fact is otherwise limited.

That said – the appeal against CIT will likely be up to 5 days. They may shy at the extent of the task – although putting the law right is what they are there to do. The alternative is to have a two week trial in front of a clever Commercial Court Judge who would make light work of this – thoughts ?

In doing the drafting it has also occurred to me that tactically given the situation they are now in - PO might want to consider accepting implied term (t) (or a slight variety on it) ie. that PO have a duty of reasonable care when its dealing with matters associated with the accounting process with SPM's. This would be on the basis that it is “necessary.” This coupled with the Agreed Implied terms of “necessary co-operation” should give the Court of Appeal a degree of comfort to deal with the problems highlighted by the Judge.

I thought I would mention this now so that people could start thinking about it. It would also focus yet further attention on the extent that *other* implied terms were “necessary”.

Best,

D.

David Cavender Q.C.

One Essex Court
Temple
London EC4Y 9AR



ONE ESSEX COURT

Direct dial:
Switchboard:
Fax number:
Mobile:



www.oeclaw.co.uk

The contents of this email are CONFIDENTIAL and may be PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone **GRO** and delete this email.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
