

Message

From: Paula Vennells [GRO]
on behalf of Paula Vennells [GRO]
Sent: 09/06/2012 11:00:11
To: Alwen Lyons [GRO]
Subject: Re: 2nd Sight TOR

Thx - don't worry. We spoke and it's ok. We'll pick up tomorrow.

By the way, what is your home address and tel no - just been checking my contact list and can't see it.

P

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Jun 2012, at 11:10, "Alwen Lyons" [GRO] wrote:

> Paula in case Susan doesn't pick this up as she is in Berlin and before you speak to Alice. The issue that came to light with the list of MP cases was that they included the Mishra you will remember the case and the publicity she went to prison and had her baby whilst in there. The husband got publicity through radio and press. Susan's anxiety and she raised this at the meeting with Alice before you joined was whether now contacting her to tell her we review the case would be a red rag to a bull.

> Alice feels this is the business pushing back unnecessarily and she feels this has happened throughout the process and she is having to keep pushing us!

> Susan is getting external advice on the effect this would have on cases which have been through the courts.

>
> If you want a call before you call Alice my phone is on

>
> Thanks Alwen

>
> Sent from Blackberry

>
> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Paula Vennells

> Sent: Saturday, June 09, 2012 10:51 AM

> To: Alice Perkins [GRO]

> Cc: Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons

> 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" [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