

Message

---

**From:** Holmes Jan R [/O=ICL/OU=UKSOUTH FEL01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=HOLMESJ]  
**Sent:** 07/06/2004 13:50:01  
**To:** Lenton-Smith Colin [/O=ICL/OU=UKSOUTH FEL01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=LENTON-SMITHC]  
**Subject:** Cleveleys

Colin,

I've just updated myself with the latest on this case and the news is not good.

Jim Cruise has taken early retirement so I ended up speaking to Mandy Talbot, who was his boss. The PM rejected the offer that was made to her some time ago and a trial date has been set for August (I don't know exactly when). POL are still taking advice as to how best to deal with this and Mandy's view/belief was that the safest way to manage this is to throw money at it and get a confidentiality agreement signed. She is not happy with the 'Experts' report as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court.

She was talking about taking the option to admit the report and concede that the contents are an accurate reflection of what happened (the HSH transcripts are an accurate reflection of what happened it's just the 'Expert' opinion is the problem). The liability question is removed and it's then just about 'how much to go away and keep your mouth shut'.

One concern I have is that while they've been dickering about waiting for guidance from their agents, the trial date has been set and it is now too late for them to enter a Witness Statement that might further repudiate the Expert's original report. This means that their Council might have to have thorough briefing, by us, before going to Court.

Do we need to involve Mason's at this stage?

Regards,

Jan Holmes

Programme Assurance

**GRO**

**GRO**

*This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are confidential and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.*