

**Marilyn Benjamin**

---

**From:** warwicktatford [GRO]  
**Sent:** 08 October 2010 15:49  
**To:** Jarnail A Singh  
**Subject:** Fw: misra  
**Attachments:** C.htm  
Sent using BlackBerry® from Orange

-----Original Message-----

**From:** warwicktatford [GRO]  
**Date:** Fri, 8 Oct 2010 11:37:38  
**To:** <jarnail.a.singh [GRO]>  
**Reply-To:** warwicktatford [GRO]  
**Subject:** Fw: misra

Dear Jarnail,

Please see the below emails. Keith Hadrill's document sets out a history of the case that in parts I struggle to recognise. You may want to think what parts you accept and what you dispute.

As far as I am concerned what really matters is that we completed secondary disclosure when we served the logs, as I understand it on or about 8 march. The ball was then in the defence's court.

W

Sent using BlackBerry® from Orange

-----Original Message-----

**From:** warwicktatford [GRO]  
**Date:** Fri, 8 Oct 2010 08:10:37  
**To:** Keith Hadrill [GRO]  
**Reply-To:** warwicktatford [GRO]  
**Subject:** Re: misra

I have had a chance to read this now Keith. I am afraid that it is inaccurate in many respects. Most particularly Critchlow did not order that there should be no more disclosure. He simply treated the new request with derision.

My point is simply this. We repeatedly asked for focussed disclosure requests, sadly without success. In particular I repeatedly asked for suggestions as to a suitable time span for the logs. None was forthcoming. We were forced to choose a time span. It is not our fault if your expert would have preferred a different period. After all he had known about Falkirk since Jan.

At the last hearing I made it clear that if you wanted more disclosure you would have to apply to the court. A dusty response from the judge in no way prevented you from making a more considered application. Also of course we would have considered fairly any appropriately argued request.

08/10/2010

At the moment I am keeping an entirely open mind whether to object or not to parts of your report. I await the discussion between the experts. I anticipate they will have much to discuss after Jenkins serves his new statement.

I am sorry if this sounds depressing. I just thought you should have notice of my provisional views.

W

Sent using BlackBerry® from Orange

-----Original Message-----

From: "Keith Hadrill" [GRO]

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2010 20:51:48

To: Warwick Tatford [GRO] >

Subject: misra

Dear Warwick,

I have left a message of your mobile re the attached submission note.

It is relevant to your intention to apply to exclude some of McL conclusions etc.

I have drafted it so as to set out the history and disclosure problems etc.

Hopefully, it will save a lot of time, initially, with the Judge.

Give me a call

Keith

(See attached file: C.htm)