POL00109547

**To:** Louise Chatfield [GRO]
**From:** Mark R Davies [GRO]
**Sent:** Tue 11/11/2014 8:11:43 PM (UTC)
**Subject:** Re: Possible script

It's fine

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 11 Nov 2014, at 18:35, "Louise Chatfield" GRO wrote:

I've put this in your diary on 18 Nov – the next available time you are free. Is that too late? Belinda has accepted the invite.
L

---

**From:** Mark R Davies
**Sent:** 07 November 2014 19:52
**To:** Belinda Crowe
**Cc:** Melanie Corfield; Belinda Crowe; Louise Chatfield
**Subject:** Re: Possible script

Hi

This is brilliant. Lets discuss next steps ASAP - combined with your final report plan?
Louise, can you find some time?
Mark
Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone
On 4 Nov 2014, at 08:05, "Belinda Crowe" GRO wrote:

Mark, we discussed a possible off the record. Would need a bit of tiding but potential (pick and mix) script below:

- The media focus seems to be about 'miscarriages of justice' and unsafe/wrongful prosecutions
- Its pure speculation and conjecture
- Whilst we might expect that from some media outlets (its good copy) we are surprised at the BBC - we'd expect a more balanced fact based approach POL like the BBC has to protect public funds. It's a criminal offence not to pay your TV licence. Theft is a criminal offence. Fraud is a Criminal Offence. False accounting is a criminal offence.
- We didn't make the law by we do have a responsibility to use it to protect POL, its customers and public funds
- Yet BBC appears to be ignoring that
- Surely you understand you cannot expect POL to comment on cases the courts have decided, that's a matter for the Courts, what do you expect us to say?
- The Courts convict and overturn, not us. We'd be accused of interfering with the legal process
- If a prosecution was wrong it's not for us to say. We prosecute, not convict. We cannot say whether they Court got it wrong.
- Anyway, we take our duties as prosecutor seriously, we have to
- We have and continue to disclose any new material that may be relevant to a person we have

POL00109547

prosecuted

- The appears to be referring to cases without bothering to look at the detail of them, or finding out how the court process works. You might want to have a look at some of the cases some of the more sensationalist media outlets refer to and see what you think.
- Why on earth would POL have deliberately prosecuted people if we were not entitled to?
- Everyone in the Scheme gets a full investigation and Second Sight review. We have sent out almost 100 reports to people, some of whom have been convicted.
- We've investigated each point the applicant has made as best we can - we provided funding for people to get professional advice
- We've found no evidence which makes us think we got it wrong
- And that's our view - don't you think if an applicant (and their advisor) had seen something in the investigation that gave them grounds for appeal they would appeal? No one has yet.
- If this happens you'd know - POL couldn't suppress that even if we wanted (which we wouldn't)
- Just because we prosecute rather than the CPS doesn't mean don't follow the CPS code - we have to have evidence and satisfy ourselves that prosecution is in the public interest
- as for the Scheme, if PO broke cover just because others are speculating, and started to discuss matters which may be discussed in mediation we'd be accused of undermining the Scheme.
- and we cannot respond publicly on individual cases for confidentiality reasons
- having set it up we have to let it run its course even though others might be trying to put pressure on us by going public. They know we cannot respond.
- its uncomfortable for us but as a reputable organisation we cannot get drawn into an unhelpful speculative debate or comment on cases publicly. Its easy for an individual to say to the media I was wrongfully prosecuted/treated badly/no evidence but POL cannot respond by giving details of that case.
- So we sit here and resist calls for statements/interviews which is interpreted as guilt/culpability knowing that the moment we say something at this stage we will be vilified.
- If there has been a wrongful prosecution or a problem is found with horizon you'll know soon enough

Best wishes
Belinda Crowe

**Belinda Crowe**
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline: GRO

GRO

GRO