POL00076592

Message

From: Tom Wechsler [GRO]
Sent: 17/12/2014 01:02:48
To: Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]; Mark R Davies [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]; Chris Aujard [GRO]; Jarnail Singh [GRO]; Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]
CC: Gavin Lambert [GRO]; Melanie Corfield [GRO]
Subject: Re: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

The Greg Knight letter has gone on M001 (Castleton).

The Karen Lumley letter is with Tony to clear.

Tom

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 12:20 AM
To: Rodric Williams; Mark R Davies; Patrick Bourke; Chris Aujard; Jarnail Singh; Andrew Parsons
GRO
Cc: Gavin Lambert; Melanie Corfield; Belinda Crowe; Tom Wechsler
Subject: Re: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

Some thoughts from me to inform the lines Patrick is putting together.

The angle appears to be coming together as miscarriage of justice.

Added Jarnail to the copy list, as there are criminal law matters, for expediency. But we should push back hard on many of these. We have set up just what we were asked to set up by way of the Scheme and despite the fact that the Scheme has not yet concluded and cases have just started to go through mediation we are already being put under pressure to do something different.

I have not heard back from Tony about his letter.

Patrick, are you happy with what you have so far and we can pick up first thing.

Chris I think you have been in contact with the CCRB recently.

Also when we go back to Richard we should let him know that over the pas couple of days Tony has written to a number of applicants (including JA's case) explaining that they have been considered by the WG and are awaiting further info etc.
Also any other MP letters which have cleared over the past couple of days. Tom could you confirm please?

Best wishes
Belinda

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

POL00076592

On 16 Dec 2014, at 21:29, Mark R Davies [GRO] wrote:

Also agreed

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone

On 16 Dec 2014, at 21:08, "Patrick Bourke" [GRO] wrote:

Yes. Needless to say some of the 'asks' cannot be seriously entertained, surely ?

P

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 09:01 PM
To: Chris Aujard; Mark R Davies; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Gavin Lambert
Subject: Fw: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

To see below.
Chris, there are some lines on this that we need view.
Patrick, would you be able to put some lines together on what is below.
I agree with Richard that being conciliatory got us to where we are now so she should not be.
Best wishes
Belinda

[GRO]

From: Callard Richard (ShEx) [GRO]
Sent: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 08:54 PM
To: Swinson MPST [GRO]
Cc: McInnes Tim (ShEx) [GRO]; Baugh James (ShEx) [GRO]; Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke
Subject: RE: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

Alysa (cc Belinda and Patrick for expediency)

Not surprising re decision not to share the speech. Trying to answer each point in turn:

1. We have a line on that - **AND WE COULD BE VERY ACCOMMODATING, WHY WOULD WE DESTROY DOCUMENTS**
2. An independent review of an independent review is a bit odd. Particularly given Tony Hoopers very independent stance. Who would do it? **WE CANNOT AGREE TO AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF A SCHEME OVERSEEN WITH A WG WITH AN INDEPENDENT CHAIR - THIS WOULD AMKE TONY"S POSITION UNTENABLE, SURELY**
3. We have a line for that. **WE COULD STRESS THAT THERE IS NO TIME BAR TO APPLICATIONS TO THE SCHEME OR US MEDIATING THEM**
4. SS probably need permission from the working group. They have gone native but I think Jo could possibly commit to asking Tony about it at the risk of putting tony in a

POL00076592

difficult place. Belinda / Patrick, could we have a view and a line please? **THE LINE HAS TO BE NO. A NUMBER OF PRACTICAL REASONS - GONE NATIVE, POL IS PAYING, NEED TO LEAVE THE SCHEME TO RUN ITS COURSE. BUT IT PUTS TONY IN AN INVIDIOUS POSITION, SS ARE ADVISORS TOTHE WG. CANNOT HAVE THEM BRIEFING ON THE SCHEME**

5. Pass, over to POL. I know they are, or were, a prosecuting authority but if there has been theft or fraud and its in the public interest they have no real choice. Otherwise what is the deterrent? Anyone could put theft down to 'the system'. Belinda, could you do a line please? **NEED A VIEW FROM CHRIS. HOWEVER, ASSUMING THE ASK IS THAT POL SHOULD NOT PROSECUTE ITS OWN CASES (NOT JUST THESE CASES AS IT HAS ALREADY DONE SO) THIS IS AN OPERATIONAL ISSUE FOR POL BUT IN ANY EVENT COULD NOT JUST COMMIT TO SOMETHING LIKE THIS WITHOUT WITHOUT PROPER CONSIDERATION.**

6. We will think of a line. But presumably if they win the case they would get costs back. Why should spms be any different to other people? Belinda /Patrick, any views? **CHRIS/RODRIC/JARNAIL NEED TO RESPOND TO THIS**

7. Pass, and interested in POLs view. At the risk of creating another independent review, I suppose we could consider it if it meant looking at all the evidence available (at least the failings of the spms could come to light and it could offer the potential to draw a line under the cases). Belinda / Patrick, again, a line and a view please. Presumably the commissioner could find there is nothing to investigate, but this could risk generating another story in its own right so if we did agree we'd have to be clear that this was to draw a line and not because we thought something was worth reviewing. On balance I think we should probably say no but open minded. **NEED A VIEW FROM CHRIS/JARNAIL BUT NORMALLY A CASE IS REFERRED TO TO THE COMMISSION AFTER AN APPEAL. BUT REALLY SHOULD SAY NO.**

Belinda / Patrick - I'll be in from half we've tomorrow (or just after). I am busy from 10-1 and cant escape so would be great to get this sorted before ten if we can.

Alysa - some of these requests are rather unreasonable eg point 5. Jo might have to be a bit more "front footie" on those to close it down. Being conciliatory got us to where we are currently, so am keen not to repeat past mistakes.

R

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Swinson MPST
Sent: 16/12/2014 19:56
To: Callard Richard (ShEx)
Subject: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

Hi Richard,

So James no longer plans to share his speech with us ahead of time as apparently it is very inflammatory and he is worried about putting in an email (this bodes well for tomorrow...)

Him and Jo had a quick catch up in which he outlined his main “asks”. I understand you’ve got a packed day tomorrow but grateful if you could ask POL about some of these as Jo will need to respond in her speech and would be good to know how warm she should be to these asks.

POL00076592

1. He would like us to ask POL not destroy any documents relating to these cases in the scheme. This for me raises the question of, are they destroying documents now? How reasonable do you think this ask is?
2. He would also like there to be an Independent Review of the Scheme. This one seems as bit less likely as it's already an independent working group.
3. He would like there to be no statute of limitations on the claims being made through the scheme. Is this one feasible?
4. He'd like Second Sight to do a briefing for MPs on the scheme and its progress. Jo would like to commit to asking Tony Hooper about this. What do you think?
5. He would like us to ask POL to stop acting as prosecutor on these cases. It's unclear to me who would then prosecute instead or why POL currently do it the way they do but Jo said she'd previously discussed this with Paula and she had been open to this.
6. We need to get some lines of what to say in response to the claim that SPM can't appeal court verdicts because of the cost
7. James would like the Criminal Cases Review Commissioner to set up an independent review of the cases relating to Horizons as well. Jo would like to be able to commit to writing to the Commissioner and asking him to do this, what do you think?

Thanks,
Alysa

Alysa Remtulla | Private Secretary to the Minister for Employment Relations and Consumer Affairs | Department for Business, Innovation & Skills | 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET |
Work: GRO | mpst.swinson GRO | www.bis.gov.uk

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes
---