1	Wednesday, 21 December 2011	1	Q. And in 2005, you were convicted at Southwark Crown Court
2	(10.04 am)	2	and sentenced to six months in prison, half that
3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Good morning, Mr Barr.	3	sentence being suspended?
4	MR BARR: Good morning, sir. Our first witness is	4	A. Yes, that's correct.
5	Mr Hipwell.	5	Q. And you pleaded not guilty at the trial, so it followed
6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.	6	that you were disbelieved by the jury?
7	MR JAMES HIPWELL (affirmed)	7	A. Absolutely.
8	Questions by MR BARR	8	Q. Whilst waiting for the investigation and trial, you
9	MR BARR: Good morning, Mr Hipwell.	9	worked for Punch magazine?
10	A. Good morning.	10	A. Yes, I did.
11	Q. Could you tell the Inquiry, please, your full name?	11	Q. And also for Max Clifford Associates?
12	A. It is William James Quolian(?) Hipwell.	12	A. Yes, that's correct.
13	Q. You've provided the Inquiry with a witness statement.	13	Q. You then joined Dennis Publishing to work on a men's
14	Are you familiar with the contents?	14	lifestyle magazine, Inside Edge?
15	A. Yes, I am.	15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And are they true and correct to the best of your	16	Q. Since your release from prison, you've worked mostly in
17	knowledge and belief?	17	online publishing, especially on two sports websites?
18	A. Yes, they are.	18	A. Yes.
19	Q. We will take your witness statement as read, although	19	Q. And you've also had a media column in the Sunday Express
20	I'm going to ask you questions arising from it. Can we	20	and have written for the Guardian and the Observer?
21	start first of all, please, with your career history?	21	A. Yes, that's right.
22	You tell us in the first paragraph of your statement	22	Q. And you now live abroad where you continue to work as
23	that you began a career as a journalist in 1991?	23 24	a freelance writer and journalist?
24	A. Yes, that's correct.		A. Yes, that's right.
25	Q. You trained through Reed Business Publishing and started Page 1	25	Q. Against that background, can I now ask you more about Page 3
			1 450 0
1	off in trade publications, first of all Sunday Business	1	life working for the Daily Mirror? First of all, can we
2	and then Business Age magazine?	2	deal with the topic of corporate governance?
3	A. Yes, that's right.	3	A. Yes.
4	Q. In 1998, you were recruited alongside a fellow	4	Q. How much corporate governance was there in respect of
5	Business Age colleague, Anil Bhoyrul, to start a new	5	ethics when you were working for the Daily Mirror?
6	daily business column in the Mirror?	6	A. I don't think there was very much at all. I was not
7	A. Yes.	7	given a copy of the PCC code. I was not some we were
8	Q. That column was called City Slickers and it was designed	8	not briefed on a regular basis, we were not about it.
9	to popularise business content?	9	We were not asked whether we were ever sticking to it
10	A. Yes, that's correct.	10	when we were writing stories. And this is the culture
11	Q. That column became very popular and influential, didn't	11	I worked in. You would never ever hear reference to the
12	it?	12	PCC code, and actually, the term corporate governance is
13	A. Yes, it certainly did.	13	not a term that most journalists would recognise. It's
14	Q. But unfortunately there was a difficulty, quite a severe	14	not as if we are accountants or whether we are company
15	difficulty, in that you were tempted into insider	15	executives. Corporate governance is not a term that is
16	dealing, weren't you?	16	ever used in a newspaper office. It's just a totally
17	A. Well, I wasn't charged with insider dealing, I was	17	alien concept to most journalists. You're not asked,
18	charged with something else; but it is true that we	18	ever, whether you are sticking to the terms of the PCC
19	*		code because it never came up.
20	in the column, yes.	20	Q. Looking at that in a little bit more detail, please,
21 22	Q. I'll be precise, then. You were charged with conspiracy to contravous Section $47(2)$ of the Einspecial Services	21	Mr Hipwell, first of all, by the time you joined the
	to contravene Section 47(2) of the Financial Services	22	Daily Mirror, you'd been in journalism for seven years? A. Yes.
23 24	Act 1986, contrary to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977?	23 24	A. Yes.Q. Including training with Reed Business.
24 25	Act 1977? A. Yes.	24 25	A. Mm.
23	A. Tes. Page 2	25	A. Will. Page 4
	1 450 2		1 "50 "

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Г

1	Q. Had you been taught about the PCC code at the academic	1	"The commission found that Mr Morgan had breached
2	stage?	2	the code of practice by purchasing shares in a company,
3	A. I don't remember ever being taught about the PCC code.	3	Viglen Technology plc, which had been recently tipped by
4	My training was in magazine journalism. It was a course	4	his newspaper. It also concluded that Mr Morgan had not
5	recognised by the Periodicals Training Council.	5	taken sufficient care to ensure that his staff were
6	I suspect that if I had trained in one of the better	6	acting in accordance with the code and that his conduct,
7	known newspaper courses, that it might have featured	7	including the breach in relation to Viglen, had fallen
8	more prominently, but as far as my own training went,	8	short of the high professional standards demanded by the
9	with a PTC-recognised course, it didn't come up at all.	9	code."
10	Q. Were you familiar with the code through your work on	10	So it would appear that to that extent, ie criticism
10	trade magazines?	11	of the editor's care, that the judge's comments were
12	A. No. Not at all.	12	supported by the findings that the PCC had made in 2000,
12	Q. Mr Morgan in his witness statement refers to some	12	and which are rehearsed here in 2006.
13	fold-out copies of the PCC code available at the	13	A. Sure. I totally agree with that.
15	Daily Mirror. Did you ever see any of those?	15	Q. If we move to tab 10, please, where we have I think
16	A. No. I've never ever seen a copy of the PCC code whilst	16	it looks like the press release from the PCC's ruling in
17	I was working at Trinity Mirror at all.	17	2000, we see a little more. There are a number of
18	Q. Mr Morgan also gave evidence that the PCC code was	18	bullet point findings there on the page. Can I ask you
19	displayed on the wall at the offices of the	19	to look at the third and the fourth. In relation to the
20	Daily Mirror. Do you recall that?	20	third, it says:
21	A. No, I do not, no.	21	"The purchase of shares in Wiggins Group and
22	Q. In the sentencing remarks made by Mr Justice Beatson,	22	Viglen plc by editor Piers Morgan were breaches of the
23	which you deal with in the middle paragraph on page 2 of	23	code, in the case of the former share purchase only on
24	your witness statement, the judge said:	24	a technicality, as both companies had been written about
25	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from	25	in the newspaper recently at the time of the purchase.
	Page 5		Page 7
1	the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of	1	The purchase of shares in Corporate Executive Search was
2	a culture of advance information about tips and share	2	not a breach of the code."
3	dealing within the office."	3	And then the bottom:
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think you ought to read the earlier	4	"There was inadequate supervision of City Slickers
5	sentence than that, which is:	5	by the editor, whose responsibility it is to ensure that
6	"I also take into account the fact that at that time	6	the code is applied rigorously on the newspaper. This
7	there was no formal code of conduct for journalists at	7	also raised a breach of the code of practice."
8	the Daily Mirror."	8	So we see there the finding that your editor was
9	Then it goes on:	9	
10			held in breach of the code in relation to supervision.
10	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from	10	A. Correct.
11	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of	10 11	A. Correct.Q. Below that it reads:
11 12	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share	10 11 12	A. Correct.Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has
11 12 13	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office."	10 11 12 13	A. Correct.Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that
11 12 13 14	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes.	10 11 12 13 14	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated."
11 12 13 14 15	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office."A. Yes.MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more.	10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell
11 12 13 14 15 16	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office."A. Yes.MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more.A. Sure.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	"There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office."A. Yes.MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more.A. Sure.Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for a request for the original PCC investigation conducted 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical training whilst you were working for the Daily Mirror?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for a request for the original PCC investigation conducted in 1999 and 2000 to be reopened. 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical training whilst you were working for the Daily Mirror? A. No, none whatsoever.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for a request for the original PCC investigation conducted in 1999 and 2000 to be reopened. A. Mm. 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical training whilst you were working for the Daily Mirror? A. No, none whatsoever. Q. Did you see any visible signs of ethical leadership from
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for a request for the original PCC investigation conducted in 1999 and 2000 to be reopened. A. Mm. Q. Of relevance to the comments that we've just heard, can 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical training whilst you were working for the Daily Mirror? A. No, none whatsoever. Q. Did you see any visible signs of ethical leadership from any of the senior managers at the Daily Mirror?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for a request for the original PCC investigation conducted in 1999 and 2000 to be reopened. A. Mm. Q. Of relevance to the comments that we've just heard, can I take you to the second paragraph under the subheading, 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical training whilst you were working for the Daily Mirror? A. No, none whatsoever. Q. Did you see any visible signs of ethical leadership from any of the senior managers at the Daily Mirror?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 "There was no guidance from your superiors or from the in-house lawyers, and there was evidence of a culture of advance information about tips and share dealings within the office." A. Yes. MR BARR: Thank you. Let's explore that a little more. A. Sure. Q. First of all, can we go to tab 6 of your bundle, please. This is a ruling by the PCC. It was made in 2006. This particular ruling was made following an application for a request for the original PCC investigation conducted in 1999 and 2000 to be reopened. A. Mm. Q. Of relevance to the comments that we've just heard, can 	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Correct. Q. Below that it reads: "The Commission is pleased that Trinity Mirror has now revised its own internal procedures to ensure that such breaches of the code cannot be repeated." Just to be clear, were you around and able to tell us whether or not that in fact happened? A. No, I'd left the company by then, so I have no knowledge of it. Q. Thank you. Can I ask you whether you got any ethical training whilst you were working for the Daily Mirror? A. No, none whatsoever. Q. Did you see any visible signs of ethical leadership from any of the senior managers at the Daily Mirror?

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

1	just wasn't a subject that was addressed at all.	1	Q assisting and supervising what was on the screen.
2	Q. Just to be clear about the line management relations,	2	A. Absolutely, yes.
3	and I'm looking now at the third page of your witness	3	Q. Did he do that with you?
4	statement, is it right that your direct line manager was	4	A. Sometimes he did, yes. It's true to say that he had
5	Mr Morgan?	5	a better relationship with my fellow columnist
6	A. Yes. We were columnists, so we were outside of the news	6	Anil Bhoyrul. They were quite good friends. Most of
7	chain of command. We were outside of the control of the	7	his dealings on this probably went through Anil, I think
8	news desk. And although we had some early battles with	8	that's true to say. But yes, he did, he would come over
9	the news desk, who wanted us to be within their remit,	9	and he would have a look at what we were writing on
10	Mr Morgan was insistent that we were answerable to him	10	screen. That is from what I understand certainly true
11	and him alone. So there was no chain of command apart	11	of the Viglen story which is mentioned a lot in this
12	from us being, you know, sort of directly responsible to	12	bundle, and I understand from Anil that he saw the story
13	him and him only.	13	on screen and he even made recommendations to changing
14	Q. How often did you see Mr Morgan in practice doing your	14	it on screen. So there was that level of involvement.
15	work?	15	Q. I'm getting the impression that this is involvement
16	A. Well, a lot, because we were sitting next to the showbiz	16	which the details might have varied from day to day, but
17	desk. He was a former showbiz journalist himself. He	17	we are talking, are we, about daily contact?
18	would you know, the thing about Piers is that he	18	A. Yes. I mean, he was the editor. Everything stopped
19	is was a very hands-on editor. He would not stay in	19	with him. The whole newspaper, you know, he was it
20	his office like some editors do, take morning conference	20	seems appropriate this week, he was the Dear Leader,
21	and run the newspaper from his office. He would be out	21	that the newspaper was edited and produced with the cult
22	on the news floor. He would be he was the beating	22	of his personality. He was a very strong-minded
23	heart of the newspaper. He would go up behind	23	individual and he had enormous charm and charisma, and
24	journalists and look at what they were writing on	24	he was the newspaper. It was you know, it was all
25	screen. He would point to maybe a paragraph sort of at	25	about Piers and he did I think he did a very good job
	Page 9		Page 11
1	the bottom of the page and say, "That's your story	1	during the time I was there. I rated him very highly as
2	there, get it to the top". He was always on the floor.	2	an editor and I thought that he edited the paper with
3	He would spend upwards of half an hour a day sitting	3	a great deal of flair and he produced a very fresh and
4	with the showbiz team discussing their stories.	4	inviting newspaper, and I was very happy to be involved
5	He would it's probably true to say that he was	5	with that.
6	less interested in the City than he was in showbiz, but	6	Q. Can I now ask you a little bit about the showbusiness
7	because we sat next to them, he would also take a keen	7	team? You've told us that you were sitting close to
8	interest in what we were doing. He would ask us about	8	them.
9	the stories we were writing. He seemed very interested	9	A. Mm.
10	in the City. He liked money, he liked he wanted to	10	Q. Can I explore that? Just how close were you to the
11	know how it worked.	11	showbusiness team?
12	It's probably true to say that he was disadvantaged	12	A. I was sitting within three feet of some of the
13	by the fact that he didn't know a great deal about it,	13	journalists. The next desk.
14	but he was certainly keen to learn and he enjoyed our	14	Q. Is this an open plan office?
15	column because it was very different from what the	15	A. It's an open plan office, yes, nearer than I am to you
16	Mirror had had before in terms of its City coverage, and	16	now.
17	he was a great supporter of the column. In fact,	17	Q. How big a team was the showbusiness team?
18	I think he loved it. And for the first year that we	18	A. I can remember at least ten people who worked on it.
19	were there, I think he held the column in very high	19	Q. Did they all sit together in the same place?
20	regard and he thought it was a real contribution to the	20	A. Yes.
21	newspaper. He was, as I say, very hands-on and he took	21	Q. Or were some of them
22	a keen interest in what we were doing.	22	A. There was a showbiz desk made up of three desks, which
23	Q. So you've described him standing over the back of	23	were all arranged together, and the City desk was right
24	a journalist	24	next to it. So, you know, we were within six to eight
25	A. Yes.	25	feet of the showbusiness desk.
	Page 10		Page 12

1 0. For how long were you a part of that physical arrangement? 1 secting? By which I mean: did you think thut you were witnessing scrious wrong/doing? 3 A. Thronghout my time there, nearly two years. 3 A. Well, it didn's seem to me to be an ethical you to be any tob any to be any to be any to b				
 A. Throughout my time there, nearly two years. A. Throughout my time there, nearly two years. A. Well, it dish't sceme to me to be an oblical way to behave, but it scemed to be agenerally accepted method to well, they were - they became our frends. We - a. M. Well, they were - they became our frends. We - a. A. Well, it was a the weighed ach other's company. We would certainly socialise with them in the pub after work. We relationship with them, and I think they liked us as relationship with them, and I think they liked us as relationship with them, and I think they liked us as with stats on the thing age of your withors different from other Circity optimalists. A. Satistical to a statistic on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the thing age of your withors whork stats on the 2nd floor Claary whork stats and ext to the Mirror's and the come a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail the own at the sign with they were doing was a sightly - 1 think it was the come a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail the come a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail the rews pathering afformation. the rews pathering afformation. the come a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail the diff remark. Jubit stats were tas a singhtly - 1 think it was the come a	1	Q. For how long were you a part of that physical	1	seeing? By which I mean: did you think that you were
4 0. And what level of interaction did you have generally 4 behave, but it scemed to be agrencelly accepted method 6 A. Well, they were - they became our friends. We 5 to get a story. It seemed to be perfectly acceptable to 7 1 think we enjoyed each other's company. We would 7 a daily basis in 1999, especially the later half of 8 certaily socialise with them in the pub after work. We 9 sometimes went to the same parties. We had a very good 9 orrelationship with them, and 1 think they liked us as 10 mamber of the Mirror's soluties work weils the hypened 10 relationship with them, and 1 think they liked us as 10 mamber of the Mirror's soluties work weils 12 offferent from other City journalists. 10 Q. Did you report to your superior, M Worgan, the fact 13 0. Agains the background, the gage. Your winness 14 A. No. I mean 14 the Mirror's solutions on the 2.2 and floor of Camry 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 11 they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out 14 A. No. I mean 12 they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out 14 A stary, the semine difficultin was 13 sectona	2	arrangement?	2	witnessing serious wrongdoing?
5 with the showhusness team during the course of a day? 5 to get a story. It seemed to be perforely acceptable to a daily basis in 1999, especially the latter half of 6 A. Well, they were - they became our friends. We	3	A. Throughout my time there, nearly two years.	3	A. Well, it didn't seem to me to be an ethical way to
6 A. Well, hey were - hey became our friends. We 6 some of the Mirror's senior editors, and I saw it on 7 I think we enjoyed each other's company. We would 7 a daily basis in 1999, especially the latter half of 8 certainly socialise with them in the pub after work. We 9 9 every day, and that it became apparent that a great 11 orelationship with them, and I think they liked us as 10 number of the Mirror's howbusiness stores would come 12 offferent from other City journalists. 10 O. Joi or eport to your superior, M' Morgan, the fact 13 O. Agains the ubic/group or winess 11 that showbusiness journalists were hacking phones? 14 which starts on the third page of your winess 14 A. No. Incun - 15 statement, halfway down the gae. You say: 15 A. Because it secmed to me that what they were doing was 17 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 entirely accepted by, as I say, the senior editors on 18 showbusiness team - sai a next to the Mirror's ing out 1 A. Because it seemed to he, huror 's senior editors on 19 showbusiness team - sai as a slightly underhand thing to do, hur not 10 10 the apparentad, you chane, tais sing vefan	4	Q. And what level of interaction did you have generally	4	behave, but it seemed to be a generally accepted method
7 a daily basis in 1999, especially the latter half of 8 certainly socialise with them in the pub after work. We 9 9 sometimes went to the same parties. We thad a very god. 9 10 relationship with them, and I think they liked us us 10 11 off the came we were, it's probably true to say, 11 number of the Mirror's showbusiness toories would come 12 different from other City journalists. 12 Q. Did you report to your superior, Mr Morgan, the fact 13 Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 14 A. No. I mean - 15 statement, halfway down the page. You say: 15 Q. Why not? 16 "Another example of the lack of corporate governance 17 A. No. I mean - 17 sthe Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 at the Mirror was able to see at close hand how 17 showbusiness journalists can'y gout 21 ilegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 21 repeade privacy infringements, asing what has now 20 secn as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 repeade privacy infringements, asing what has now 21 alas iy asy, it becane. 11 withik a daily gart of their	5	with the showbusiness team during the course of a day?	5	to get a story. It seemed to be perfectly acceptable to
8 certainly socialise with them in the pub after work. We 8 1999, where I would go as far as to say that it happened 9 sometimes wort to the same parties. We had a very good 9 every day, and that it became apparent that a great 11 well becames we were, it's probably true to say, 10 number of the Mirror's showbusiness isouralistes. 12 different from other City journalists. 10 D. Did you report to your superior. Mr Morgan, the fact 13 Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 11 that showbusiness journalists were hacking phones? 14 which starts on the third page of your winess 14 A. No. I mean - 15 Q. Why not? 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was entirely accepted by, as I say, the senior editors on 16 showbusiness toan. I sat tot to Mirror's 18 the weyspaper, and, you know, I just didn't - I didn't 17 sthotmetinessed journalists carrying out 20 secane a sightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I witnessed journalists targen of the impression that 14 No. 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequery 27 17 26 repatic secorend on vicermail's at the M	6	A. Well, they were they became our friends. We	6	some of the Mirror's senior editors, and I saw it on
9 sometimes went to the same parter. We had a very good 9 every day, and that it became apparent that a great number of the Mirror's showbusiness tories would come 10 relationship with them, and I think they liked us as 10 number of the Mirror's showbusiness tories would come 12 different from other City journalists. 12 Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 13 V. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 13 A. No. I mean - 15 statement, halfway down the page. You say: 14 A. No. I mean - 16 "Another example of the lack of corporate governance 14 A. No. I mean - 18 showbusiness journalists on the 2ahl Oor of Carary 19 do that. I thought it was as lightly I think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out 21 they operated. I witnessed journalists at my page. 22 24 systems of celebrities, their friends, publicits and 24 as I say, it became. J think, a duily part of their 25 page 13 Tor gathering information. 14 Q. Did you everse or hear phone hacking paterior hacking pate	7	I think we enjoyed each other's company. We would	7	a daily basis in 1999, especially the latter half of
10 relationship with them, and I think they liked us as 10 number of the Mirror's showbusiness stories would come 11 will because we were, it's probably true to say, 11 it's muthat source. That is my clear memory. 13 Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 11 12 Q. Did you report to your superior. JK: Morgan, the fact 14 which stars on the third page of your witness 13 Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 14 which stars on the third page of your witness 14 A. No. I mean - 15 3. Why not? 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 16 "Another example of the lack of corporate goormance 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 11 methory as a big byt and utchinad thing to do, but not 11 do that. I thought it was a slightly mutchinad thing to do, but not 12 repeated privacy infringments, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 17 public relations executives. The openness and frequency 25 page 15 14 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or	8	certainly socialise with them in the pub after work. We	8	1999, where I would go as far as to say that it happened
11 well because we were, it's probably true to say, 11 from that source. That is my clear memory. 12 different from other City journalists. 2 0. Did you report to your superior, Mr Morgan, the fact 13 Q. Agains that background. I'm going to read the paragraph 13 that showbusiness journalists mee hacking phones? 14 which starts on the third page of your witness 14 A. No. I mean 15 statement, halfway down the page. You say: 15 5 Q. My not? 15 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 at he Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 18 showbusiness fournalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly - I think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I vimessed journalistic arrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infingements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 baccing activities gave me the impression that 14 4 as (the foam malages?) 3 for gathe	9	sometimes went to the same parties. We had a very good	9	every day, and that it became apparent that a great
11 well because we were, it's probably true to say, 11 from that source. That is my clear memory. 12 different from other City journalists. 2 0. Did you report to your superior, Mr Morgan, the fact 13 Q. Agains that background. I'm going to read the paragraph 13 that showbusiness journalists mee hacking phones? 14 which starts on the third page of your witness 14 A. No. I mean 15 statement, halfway down the page. You say: 15 5 Q. My not? 15 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 at he Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 18 showbusiness fournalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly - I think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I vimessed journalistic arrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infingements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 baccing activities gave me the impression that 14 4 as (the foam malages?) 3 for gathe	10	relationship with them, and I think they liked us as	10	number of the Mirror's showbusiness stories would come
12 different from other City journalists. 12 Q. Did you report to your superior, Mr Morgan, the fact 13 Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph 13 that showbusiness journalists were hacking phones? 14 A. No. I'mean - 14 A. No. I'mean - 15 statement, haftway down the page. You say: 15 Q. Why not? 16 "Another example of the lack of corporate governance 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 18 showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Camary 19 do that. I thought it was a sliphty - I think it was 19 showbusiness of meltered activities of its 18 the newspaper, and, you know, I just didn't - I didn't 10 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 see and a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency 25 news-gahering operation. 26 nexting was considered a bog-standard journalistic torol 3 A. No. 26 nde hard on voicemails openly across their desks. Oro 4 Q. Did you veer s	11	well because we were, it's probably true to say,	11	from that source. That is my clear memory.
13 Q. Against that background. I'm going to read the paragraph 13 that showbusiness journalists were hacking phones? 14 which starts on the third page of your witness 14 A. No. I mean - 15 statement, halfwag down the page. You say: 15 Q. Why not? 16 "Another example of the lack of corporate governance 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 17 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 18 showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly1 think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 21 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. I tjust seemel to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 24 asy vactorsidered a bog-standard journalistic tot a hacking activities from managers? 3 3 3 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that hacking activities from managers? 4 No. 4 more or th	12	different from other City journalists.	12	
14 which starts on the third page of your wimess 14 A. No. 1 mean 15 statement, halfway down the page. You say: 15 Q. Why not? 16 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 16 A. No. 1 mean 17 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 A. No. 4 mean 18 showbusiness its omt 622nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly I think it was ever 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was a ver 21 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 23 play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know, 24 systems of celebrities, their friends, publiciest and 24 as 1 say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 25 for gathering information. Page 13 10 O. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide 26 hach neard on voicemails openly across their desks. Om 6 A. No. 10 O. Did we showbusines journalists take any steps to hide 27 members of the	13	Q. Against that background, I'm going to read the paragraph	13	
15 statement, halfway down the page. You say: 15 Q. Why not? 16 "Another example of the lack of corporate governance 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 18 showbusiness team. I sat next to the Mirror's 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 19 showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly I think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I winnessed journalists carrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 23 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their news-gathering operation. Page 13 7 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did you ever see of hear phone hacking taking place or 5 members of the showbusiness team discussing what two 7 A. No. 4 Q. Did you ever see of hear pho	14		14	
16 "Another example of the lack of corporate governance 16 A. Because it seemed to me that what they were doing was 17 at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its 17 rentirely accepted by, as I say, the senior editors on 18 showbusiness team. Its mext to the Mirror's 18 the newspaper, and, you know, I just din't - I din't 19 showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly I think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I winnessed journalists carrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 24 systems of celebrities, their findes, publicist and 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequery 2 news-gathering operation. 9 7 of their hacking activities garw me the impression that 1 Q. Did you ever	15		15	Q. Why not?
17at the Mirror was the unfettered activities of its17entirely accepted by, as I say, the senior editors on18showbusiness team. I sat next to the Mirror's18the newspaper, and, you know, I just didn't - I didn't19showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary40 othat. I thought it was a slightly I think it was20Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how20seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not21they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out21illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever22repeated privacy infringements, using what has now22even considered. It just secemed to be fair game, fair23become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail24as I say, it became. I think, a daily part of their24systems of celebrities, their friends, publicists and24as I say, it became. I think, a daily part of their25public relations executives. The openness and frequency25play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know,25hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic torol4Q. Did the showbusiness team discussing what they3for gathering information.3A. No.4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or more4Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place?5members of the showbusiness team discussing what they6A. No, I did not.6haderd on voicemails openly across their desks. One6A. No, I did not.7of the reporters showed me the techni	16		16	- •
18 showbusiness team. I sat next to the Mirror's 18 the newspaper, and, you know, I just didn't - I didn't 19 showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly I think it was 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I winessed journalists carrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 23 play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know, 24 systems of celebritics, their friends, publicits and 24 as I say, it became. I think, a daily part of their 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency Page 13 Page 15 1 0 fuer hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide 2 for gathering information. 3 A. No. 4. No. I did not. 2 members of the showbusiness team discussing what they 6 A. No. I did not. 9 "The pract				• •
19 showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary 19 do that. I thought it was a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 23 play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know, 24 systems of celebrities, their friends, publicists and 23 play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know, 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency page 13 Page 15 1 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did us ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or 5 members of the showbusiness team discussing what the 4 Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or 6 had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One 6 A. No. 1 did not. 7 of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me 8 a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. 10 newspapers as well - journalists at the Mirror appacerd 0 N. No. 1 did not. <td< td=""><td>18</td><td>showbusiness team. I sat next to the Mirror's</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	18	showbusiness team. I sat next to the Mirror's		
20 Wharf Tower and so was able to see at close hand how 20 seen as a slightly underhand thing to do, but not 21 they operated. I winessed journalists carrying out 21 illegal. I don't hink the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 23 play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know, 24 systems of celebrities, their friends, publicists and 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 26 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide 2 hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic tool 3 A. No. 4 Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide 3 a constaint on o noter 6 A. No. 4 Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking activities from managers? 3 a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. 7 Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan? 6 ha didr ot k	19	showbusiness journalists on the 22nd floor of Canary	19	
21 they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out 21 illegal. I don't think the illegality of it was ever 22 repeated privacy infringements, using what has now 22 even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair 23 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail 23 play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know, 24 systems of celebrities, their friends, publicits and 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency Page 13 Page 15 1 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide 2 their phone hacking activities from managers? 3 A. No. 3 A no, Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or 5 members of the showbusiness team discussing what they 6 A. No, I did not. 7 O Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan 8 did or did not know that the practice was taking place? 9 "The practice seemed to be common on other 10 No. No Hat their counterparts from the Sun were also 11 to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also 11	20			
 become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail systems of celebrities, their friends, publicists and public relations executives. The openness and frequency Page 13 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic tool for gathering information. a Grost and their spontens how business team discussing what they for example, I would on occasion hear two or more members of the showbusiness team discussing what they had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One of the reporters howed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. "The practice seemed to be common on other newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeard to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also tistening to voicemail message, because on one to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also to know that their some scoop by hacking in and the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in that activity. Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual the sport of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is to the showbusiness desk, atthe to ging to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What wa	21	they operated. I witnessed journalists carrying out	21	
24 systems of celebrities, their friends, publicits and 24 as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their 25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency Page 13 Page 15 1 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide 2 their phone hacking activities from managers? 3 A. No. 3 "For example, I would on occasion hear two or more 4 Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or 5 members of the showbusiness team discussing what they 5 being discussed in front of Mr Morgan? 6 had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One 6 A. No, I did not. 7 O fthe reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. 4 9 "The practice seemed to be common on ther 7 Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan 11 to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also 11 was. You know, this isI cannot prove that he who 12 listening to voicemail messages, because on one 12 editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that 13 occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team j	22	repeated privacy infringements, using what has now	22	even considered. It just seemed to be fair game, fair
25 public relations executives. The openness and frequency Page 13 25 news-gathering operation. 1 of their hacking activities gave me the impression that 1 Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide their phone hacking activities from managers? 3 for gathering information. 3 A. No. 4 "For example, I would on occasion hear two or more members of the showbusiness team discussing what they had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. 4 Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or being discussed in front of Mr Morgan? 6 ha heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. 6 A. No, I did not. 7 O the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails. 7 Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that the practice was taking place? 9 "The practice seemed to be common on ther newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also 10 No. I did not. 12 listening to voicemail messages, because on one coccasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking 11 No know that it was very unlikely that he didn' know about. As I think he said yesterday in his totin' know about. As I think he said yesterday in his 16	23	become a well-known technique to hack into the voicemail	23	play. Any means to get a story. And this is, you know,
Page 13Page 151of their hacking activities gave me the impression that hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic tool for gathering information.1Q. Did the showbusiness journalists take any steps to hide their phone hacking activities from managers?3A. No.4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or more members of the showbusiness team discussing what they to the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.4Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or being discussed in front of Mr Morgan?6had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that the practice seemed to be common on other 97Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that their counterparts from the Sun were also 1110was. You know, this is I cannot prove that he who tknew what at what time, but looking at his style of 1212listening to voicemail messages, because on one 1313he didn't know that it was yoing on, because, as I have said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of this journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his hearing it themselves."18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity. Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual	24	systems of celebrities, their friends, publicists and	24	as I say, it became, I think, a daily part of their
1of their hacking activities gave me the impression that2hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic tool3for gathering information.4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or more5members of the showbusiness team discussing what they6had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me8a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.9"The practice seemed to be common on other10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also12listening to voicemail messages, because on on13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and17hearing it themselves."18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and19tatis part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is20O. It's very important that you don't name any individual21manes of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but22O. It's very important that you don't name any individual23names of the journalists on the showbusines desk, but24Tm going to ask you some more questions about this25topic. What was you attitude towards what you were26the yourd com and sit on that desk happened on that desk hap	25	public relations executives. The openness and frequency	25	news-gathering operation.
2hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic tool2their phone hacking activities from managers?3for gathering information.3A. No.4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or moremembers of the showbusiness team discussing what they4Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or5members of the showbusiness team discussing what they6A. No, I did not.7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan8a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared10No. I did not.11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also11knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness desk at the18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Page 13</td><td></td><td>Page 15</td></t<>		Page 13		Page 15
2hacking was considered a bog-standard journalistic tool2their phone hacking activities from managers?3for gathering information.3A. No.4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or moremembers of the showbusiness team discussing what they4Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or5members of the showbusiness team discussing what they6A. No, I did not.7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan8a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared10No. I did not.11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also11knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness desk at the18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19 <t< td=""><td>1</td><td>of their backing activities gave me the impression that</td><td>1</td><td>Ω Did the showhusiness journalists take any steps to hide</td></t<>	1	of their backing activities gave me the impression that	1	Ω Did the showhusiness journalists take any steps to hide
3for gathering information.3A. No.4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or more members of the showbusiness team discussing what they had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.3A. No.7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.6A. No, I did not.7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that the practice was taking place?9"The practice seemed to be common on other 10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared listening to voicemail messages, because on one occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking a bout having deleted a message from a celebrity's to voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from 1510Nest How what at what time, but looking at his style of editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of his journalists. Showbusiness desk at the 12 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbuiz desk engaging in that activity.19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk, the 2020It's very important that you don't name any individual a names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but 2323Knowing about it because of the amount of involvem				
4"For example, I would on occasion hear two or more members of the showbusiness team discussing what they had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.4Q. Did you ever see or hear phone hacking taking place or being discussed in front of Mr Morgan?7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that the practice was taking place?9"The practice seemed to be common on other newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared 11 to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also 12 listening to voicemail messages, because on one 13 occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking 14 about having deleted a message from a celebrity's 14 about having deleted a message from a celebrity's 15 voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from 16 the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and 17 hearing it themselves."16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is 20 ple on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity. 21 genera of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but 21 m going to ask you some more questions about this 22 numers of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but 23 names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but 24 migning to ask you attitude towards what you were 25 topic. What was your attitude towards what you were2224Fin going to ask you some more questions about t				
5members of the showbusiness team discussing what they had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.5being discussed in front of Mr Morgan?7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.6A. No, I did not.7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan8a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan9"The practice seemed to be common on other newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared to know that their counterparts from the Sun wre also to know that their counterparts from the Sun wre also to know that their counterparts from the Sun wre also to know that their counterparts from the Sun wre also to know that index or ensure that no journalists from the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is10was. You know, this is I cannot prove that he who knew what at what time, but looking at his style of editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that the didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his hearing it themselves."18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is 2019a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the 21 <br< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></br<>				
6had heard on voicemails openly across their desks. One6A. No, I did not.7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan8a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.8did or did not know that the practice was taking place?9"The practice seemed to be common on other9A. Well, I mean, I've discussed what kind of an editor he10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared10knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.21Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23<		•		
7of the reporters showed me the technique, giving me a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that the practice was taking place?9"The practice seemed to be common on other newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also listening to voicemail messages, because on one listening to voicemail messages, because on one listening to voicemail messages, because on one listening deleted a message from a celebrity's voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and hearing it themselves."7Q. Is there anything which makes you think that Mr Morgan did or did not know that the practice was taking place?9"The practice seemed to be common on other newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared listening to voicemail messages, because on one listening to voicemail messages, because on one listening in order to ensure that no journalists from the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is listening ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were lipeople on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.7Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual lipeople on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.7Nirror whilst I was ple on that desk happened without Piers knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25Yery often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				-
8a demonstration of how to hack into voicemails.8did or did not know that the practice was taking place?9"The practice seemed to be common on other9A. Well, I mean, I've discussed what kind of an editor he10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared10was. You know, this is I cannot prove that he who11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also11knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the20Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask				
9"The practice seemed to be common on other9A. Well, I mean, I've discussed what kind of an editor he10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared10was. You know, this is I cannot prove that he who11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also11knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the20Li's very important that you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions ab				
10newspapers as well journalists at the Mirror appeared to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also10was. You know, this is I cannot prove that he who11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also11knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the20I's very important that you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning,25topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· • ·</td>				· • ·
11to know that their counterparts from the Sun were also11knew what at what time, but looking at his style of12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the2012 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were20Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the21people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.21Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning,25topic. What was your attitude towards what yo		-		
12listening to voicemail messages, because on one12editorship, I would say that it was very unlikely that13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the2012 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were20Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the21going to ask you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning,25topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				
13occasion, I heard members of the Mirror team joking about having deleted a message from a celebrity's13he didn't know that it was going on, because, as I have14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and hearing it themselves."16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the2012 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.21Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing22Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual rames of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to		-		• •
14about having deleted a message from a celebrity's14said, he was there wasn't very much he didn't he15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the2012 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were20Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the21people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.21Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing22Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning,25topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				
15voicemail in order to ensure that no journalists from the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and hearing it themselves."15didn't know about. As I think he said yesterday in his testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is 12 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the 2022Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but 2322really that happened on that desk happened without Piers knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning, very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				
16the Sun would get the same scoop by hacking in and hearing it themselves."16testimony, he took a very keen interest in the work of his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his17hearing it themselves."17his journalists. Showbusiness is very close to his18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is 12 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing22Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement. He would come and sit on that desk in the morning, very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to		· ·		-
 hearing it themselves." A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is 12 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity. Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were topic. What was your attitude towards what you were 				
18A. Yes. I mean, that is my that is my testimony and that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is 12 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the 2022Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were18heart, he was a showbusiness columnist on the Sun, and a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the 2023Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing really that happened on that desk happened without Piers knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were2425very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				
19that is part of my memory. It is a long time ago, it is19a lot of the people on the showbusiness desk at the2012 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were20Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the21people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.21Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing22Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual22really that happened on that desk happened without Piers23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but23knowing about it because of the amount of involvement.24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning,25topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to		-		
2012 years ago now, but that is what I saw, and there were people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity.20Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing21Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but21Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing23names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were20Mirror whilst I worked there had indeed come from the Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing really that happened on that desk happened without Piers knowing about it because of the amount of involvement. He would come and sit on that desk in the morning, very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				
 21 people on the showbiz desk engaging in that activity. 22 Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but 23 I'm going to ask you some more questions about this 24 I'm going to ask you some more questions about this 25 topic. What was your attitude towards what you were 21 Sun themselves and they were old friends, and nothing 22 really that happened on that desk happened without Piers 23 knowing about it because of the amount of involvement. 24 He would come and sit on that desk in the morning, 25 very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to 				
 Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were Q. It's very important that you don't name any individual names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was you were 				
 names of the journalists on the showbusiness desk, but I'm going to ask you some more questions about this topic. What was your attitude towards what you were wery often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to 				
24I'm going to ask you some more questions about this24He would come and sit on that desk in the morning,25topic. What was your attitude towards what you were25very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
25 topic. What was your attitude towards what you were 25 very often in the afternoon as well. He wanted to				-
				•
	1			

1	discuss the stories. He's very interested in celebrity	1	celebrity PR agents."
2	gossip, and he would discuss with them the stories that	2	A. Yes.
3	they were working on and necessarily, I should imagine,	3	Q. Is that report an accurate representation of what you
4	where the stories came from, although that would	4	said to that newspaper?
5	incorporate the legal department as well, seeing as some	5	A. Yes, it is. Yes.
6	of the things they might be publishing would be	6	Q. Is it true?
7	potentially libellous and they would have to be legalled	7	A. Yes, it is.
8	by the Mirror's legal department, the first question	8	Q. And you say "bosses". I don't want you to name names,
9	being, in my experience, anyway: if we're writing	9	or indeed to identify a post so closely that a name can
10	something contentious that could get us sued, is it	10	easily be found, but can you give us an idea of where in
11	defendable? What is the evidence? Are we going to have	11	the management chain you're referring to by "bosses"?
12	to are we going to be forced into an embarrassing	12	A. Well, it would be, you know, the head of a desk. The
13	retraction? Are we going to have to pay out libel	13	section. Each desk, your know, there's a political
14	damages? These are key questions and they can only be	14	editor, there's a showbusiness editor, there's a royal
15	answered if the journalists concerned reveal where they	15	editor, there's a health editor. Depending on how
16	get the story, and they would be happy to do that to an	16	important these are in newspapers, you know, you have
17	editor or a lawyer, because that is just what happens on	17	a direct chain of command.
18	newspapers.	18	So a showbusiness editor would have a deputy
19	Q. We'll return in a moment to the question of legal	19	showbusiness editor because it's such a big area for
20	oversight and things like that. Returning to the	20	a tabloid newspaper, showbusiness news. You know, the
21	question of who knew what about phone hacking, without	21	health, maybe they might just have one journalist,
22	naming any names, did you ever witness the showbusiness	22	a health correspondent. The news desk would be made up
23	journalists talking about hacking or hacking in front of	23	of the news editor, a deputy news editor and ten
24	other managers at the Daily Mirror?	24	journalists, maybe, or 12, working underneath them on
25	A. Senior editors are considered managers on newspapers.	25	the news section of the newspaper. And then each editor
	Page 17		Page 19
1	People who are senior editors, the news editor, the	1	looks after their independent brief.
2	showbusiness editor, they are considered the newspaper's	2	So whereas we, for example, wrote a daily business
3	executives, although they are editorial, but I did not	3	column, there was also a business editor who would write
4	see hacking talked about in front of the sort of genuine	4	business news for the main section of the newspaper, but
5	management of the company, although I did see it	5	we were sort of, you know, part of the City desk, so
6	discussed with senior editorial managers.	6	that's how a newspaper works.
7	Q. Can we now look at some of the newspaper reports about	7	Q. I'd like to ask you now about the sixth paragraph down
8	phone hacking in which you have been quoted?	8	on the same page, where it reads:
9	A. Yes.	9	"Chris Hughes, a showbusiness reporter during
10	Q. I'm looking first at tab 13 of your bundle, and an	10	Hipwell's time at the Mirror who has since become
11	article from the Herald Sun published on 22 July of this	11	a defence correspondent, told the Australian Online that
12	year. It's right, isn't it, that the Herald Sun is an	12	he had never hacked voicemails or been aware of the
13	Australian newspaper?	13	practice at the Mirror."
14	A. Yes, it is. It's the same group as the Australian. But	14	Is it right that Mr Hughes was a showbusiness
15	this appeared in the Australian, but I think it's	15	reporter whilst you were working at the title?
16	obviously part of the same group and this was obviously	16	A. Yes, he was.
17	put into the Herald Sun as well as the Australian.	17	Q. And was he one of the people who sat in close proximity
18	Q. There are a number of quotations which cover the same	18	to you, as you've described?
19	ground that we've just been talking about. The one I'd	19	A. Yes, he did.
20	first like to talk to you about is on page 2, on the	20	Q. It would appear that his comments as reported here are
21	second paragraph. It reads:	21	in direct conflict with your own evidence, aren't they?
22	"One of their bosses [and you're talking now about	22	A. Yes. But that's a matter for him.
23	the shear have in a set of shear 1 dealers and shear and in stars of	23	Q. You understand, no doubt, the importance of telling the
	the showbusiness desk] would wander up and instruct		
24	a reporter to 'trawl the usual suspects', which meant	24	truth on oath, don't you?
	-		truth on oath, don't you? A. Absolutely. Page 20

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

		-	
1	Q. And despite this, do you stick by the testimony you've	1	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's not quite how it's reported,
2	given?	2	is it, Mr Hipwell? It's reported in the article as
3	A. Yes, I do.	3	a positive assertion, not just as a rumour.
4	Q. Can we move now to tab 15, please? This is a printout	4	A. But it's based on gossip. I did not work at the
5	from the Guardian's website. It's an article on Friday,	5	newspaper at the time, so I cannot I'm not sure how
6	11 August 2006. It says:	6	that story was put together, but from my conversations
7	"Hipwell: voicemail hacking rife at tabloids".	7	at the time with other journalists, and at this stage
8	A. Mm.	8	I worked for Max Clifford Associates, where I was in
9	Q. It again repeats what you've said to us, that there was	9	contact with a lot of tabloid journalists, this is how
10	widespread hacking at the Daily Mirror.	10	it came about.
11	A. Well, I mean yes, on the showbusiness desk, because	11	MR BARR: In what terms did you report this matter to the
12	I can talk about this because I sat next to the desk.	12	Guardian? Did you assert to them that it had happened
13	I sat within a few feet of people who were doing this.	13	or did you tell them that it was just the word on the
14	I have no knowledge of whether this technique was used		street?
15	on the news desk by the news journalists, so that's	15	A. I can't recall exactly what I said, but I remember
16	a matter for the senior editors on that desk at the	16	Chris Tryhorn, who is bylined here, phoning me and we
17	time.	17	discussed it, and obviously at that stage phone hacking
18	Q. I see. Four paragraphs down it says:	18	was in the news because of what had happened to
19	"'Many of the Daily Mirror's stories would come from		Clive Goodman and the News of the World, and I think
20	hacking into a celebrity's voicemail', Hipwell said of	20	obviously it was a subject that the likes of the
21	his time at the Mirror between 1998 and his sacking in	21	Guardian was interested in. I had already told them
22	early 2000."	22	back in 2002 that this was happening. There's another
23	Do you have actual knowledge of information from	23	article in my bundle to which I refer. So I imagine
24	hacking being used to support or find the basis of	24	I must have been someone that they wanted to talk to,
25	a story that was published?	25	given I was at the Mirror at the time and I had already
	Page 21		Page 23
1	A. Well, it's a long time ago. I mean, I can remember the	1	told them that this was going on.
2	practice, I can remember this was a very common thing	2	Q. Can I move now, please, to the next paragraph, which
3	for the showbusiness desk to do, but I can't remember	3	says:
4	individual stories because I didn't work on them.	4	"Hipwell added that while he and fellow city slicker
5	Q. It may be against that answer that you may not be able	5	journalist Anil Bhoyrul were under fire for writing
6	to assist me with my next question, but just in case,	6	about shares in which they had invested, a sympathetic
7	I'm going to ask it anyway. Are you able to help us	7	colleague had hacked into the voicemail of the paper's
8	with whether or not any front page splash on the	8	editor at the time, Piers Morgan, in an attempt to track
9	Daily Mirror, whilst you were working there, was in any	9	down any messages from Mirror executives."
10	way supported or informed by hacked material?	10	Do you have that?
11	A. I can't answer that for sure, but I would say yes, but	11	A. I remember it happening, yes.
12	that's conjecture.	12	Q. Is it true that a colleague actually hacked into the
13	Q. At the bottom hole punch, the article reads:	13	voicemail of Piers Morgan?
14	"He said [and I think it's referring to you] the	14	A. Yeah. Yes, he did, yes. I mean, in front of me, yes.
15	Mirror found out about Ulrika Jonsson's affair with	15	Q. In front of you?
16	Sven-Goran Eriksson from a voicemail left by the then	16	A. Yes.
17	England coach on the TV presenter's phone."	17	Q. With what result?
18	How do you know that?	18	A. I don't think it elicited a great deal of information,
19	A. Again, that is part of it was industry gossip at the	19	but he certainly he certainly tried. I mean, perhaps
20	time. I did not work at the Mirror at the time. I had	20	there was you know, perhaps there wasn't a message
21	left the Mirror by then. I do not know how that story	21	there, but he did use the technique to hack into
22	was put together, but at the time I remember the buzz in	22	Mr Morgan's phone in 2000, at the beginning of 2000.
23	the industry being that that's that it involved	23	Q. Can we go back, please, now to your witness statement.
24	a phone hack. That story. But again, I wasn't there so	24	A. Yes.
25	I don't know how that story was compiled.	25	Q. I'm looking at the fourth page. It's the paragraph
	Page 22		Page 24

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

1			
1 1	immediately after the one which I read a few minutes	1	make the assumption that if they were conducting phone
2	ago. I'll just let you find that. It's the one that	2	hacks for the News of the World, why they wouldn't do it
3	begins "During my disciplinary proceedings"; do you	3	on other newspapers, on the Sunday People or the
4	have that?	4	Sunday Mirror or the Daily Mirror. You know, it's just
5	A. Yes.	5	a nonsense.
6	Q. "During my disciplinary proceedings with Trinity Mirror,	6	Q. Just to be clear then, are you saying that to your
7	one of the showbusiness journalists, who felt I was	7	knowledge journalists who you witnessed hacking did move
8	being treated unfairly by management, offered to hack	8	on to other tabloid titles
9	into Mr Morgan's voicemail on my behalf to try to find	9	A. Yes.
10	out any information that would help my case against	10	Q afterwards, including titles other than the Sun and
11	Trinity Mirror. It seemed to me that phone hacking was	11	the Mirror?
11	widespread on the showbusiness desk at the Mirror."	12	A. Absolutely, yes.
	-		
13	So in this statement, you don't go so far as to say	13	Q. Can we now move back to an issue which you raised
14	that the journalist actually hacked into Mr Morgan's	14	earlier, which is the degree of legal scrutiny that you
15	phone; you just said that he offered to hack into	15	were under at the Mirror. I'm looking now at page 5 of
16	Mr Morgan's voicemail. So was that an incomplete	16	your witness statement, in the middle of the page. You
17	account of what actually happened?	17	tell us there that the Mirror's in-house legal team was
18	A. I guess it was. But I mean I clearly remember him doing	18	also heavily involved in assessing sources of
19	it, but I don't think it elicited any information which	19	information, primarily out of concern for potential
20	was going to be useful or interesting. So perhaps	20	libel suits.
21	I didn't think any more of it. I can remember it	21	A. Yes.
22	I remember it happening, but, again, I mean, it didn't	22	Q. You also tell us that the in-house lawyer, Mr Cruddace,
23	seem to elicit anything interesting.	23	was taking a special interest in your column and that
24	Q. You've told us that some of the journalists who were	24	the raw copy was sent to him in advance, in order to be
25	working in the showbusiness team for the Mirror had come	25	assessed for legal risk, or words to that effect?
	Page 25		Page 27
1	from the Sun.	1	A. Yes, that's right.
2	A. Yes.	2	Q. Why was your column a matter for special interest from
3	Q. You explained why you thought that there was hacking	3	
		5	the legal team?
4	going on there too. Again, without naming names or		the legal team? A. Lasked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were
4	going on there too. Again, without naming names or titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed	4	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were
5	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed	4 5	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm
	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?	4 5 6	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by
5 6 7	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessedphone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists	4 5 6 7	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much
5 6 7 8	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from	4 5 6 7 8	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was
5 6 7 8 9	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the	4 5 6 7 8 9	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something
5 6 7 8 9 10	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles?A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left the Mirror, and it's true to say that he did take a very
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. So, you know, I've always thought it's a nonsense to suppose that phone hacking at the News of the World was 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left the Mirror, and it's true to say that he did take a very keen interest in our column and, you know, we were happy
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. So, you know, I've always thought it's a nonsense to suppose that phone hacking at the News of the World was isolated an isolated incident on that newspaper, 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left the Mirror, and it's true to say that he did take a very keen interest in our column and, you know, we were happy to I mean we just did what we were told and we sent
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. So, you know, I've always thought it's a nonsense to suppose that phone hacking at the News of the World was isolated an isolated incident on that newspaper, given that some of the journalists on the News of the 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left the Mirror, and it's true to say that he did take a very keen interest in our column and, you know, we were happy to I mean we just did what we were told and we sent our copy first, but I don't know whether that was unique
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. So, you know, I've always thought it's a nonsense to suppose that phone hacking at the News of the World was isolated an isolated incident on that newspaper, given that some of the journalists on the News of the World end up on other newspapers, newspapers that are 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left the Mirror, and it's true to say that he did take a very keen interest in our column and, you know, we were happy to I mean we just did what we were told and we sent our copy first, but I don't know whether that was unique to us. I just assumed that everyone else on the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 titles, did any of the journalists who you witnessed phone hacking move on to other tabloid titles? A. Well, I mean, the thing about showbusiness journalists who work on national tabloids is that they go from newspaper to newspaper. At any one time, half the members of the Mirror showbiz desk had worked on the Sun and vice versa. As I said, I can think of four people who worked on the Mirror whilst I was there on the showbusiness desk who had worked at the Sun. And they you know, they go from newspaper to newspaper. It's quite common for a showbusiness journalist to go from the Mirror to the Sun to the News of the World, back to the Sunday People, as and when jobs become vacant. And, you know, they fill the same roles on other newspapers. So, you know, I've always thought it's a nonsense to suppose that phone hacking at the News of the World was isolated an isolated incident on that newspaper, given that some of the journalists on the News of the 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. I asked Mr Cruddace this and he said that we were getting quite a lot of solicitors' letters. I think I'm right in saying we were only successfully sued once by a Mr Victor Kiam from a company that he liked so much that he bought it. It made electric shavers and he was well-known for this catchphrase and we wrote something about him and his company that he didn't like and he sued and he won and the Mirror had to pay out. That was some time after Mr Cruddace came to me and said that we would have to send the raw copy from our column to him so that he could check it for defamation first. He would legal it first. So we would send it. We would email it to him or put it in a shared folder so that he could have a look at it before it went through to the page layout artist to put the page together. So we did that for at least a year before we left the Mirror, and it's true to say that he did take a very keen interest in our column and, you know, we were happy to I mean we just did what we were told and we sent our copy first, but I don't know whether that was unique

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

1	said, a newspaper doesn't want to face an embarrassing	1	being a tabloid newspaper, business stories rarely make
2	libel action and have to print a retraction, an apology,	2	the front page. We actually launched the column with
3	and maybe even have to pay out some significant libel	3	a story which turned out not to be true about two large
4	damages as well.	4	supermarket groups merging, Asda and Safeway. I wanted
5	Q. And was that every copy of your column, every single one		to run it as an item in our column, which was at the
6	had been scrutinised?	6	back of the newspaper. Piers saw it and thought it was
7	A. Yes. Yes, absolutely, yes.	7	a good enough story to splash the newspaper with, so we
8	Q. Moving now to the editorial team's interest in	8	ended up launching our column on the very first day
9	scrutinising stories, which you also mentioned, what	9	splashing on a story which turned out not to be true.
10	sort of interest did you see from, first of all, the	10	Q. To what extent
11	editor in relation to scrutinising stories before they	11	A. But Piers was content to run the story. He asked where
11	were published?	12	it came from. I told him. He thought the source was
12	A. You know, I've described what sort of editor Piers was,	12	good enough. He ran the story.
13			
14	but I would often see him late at night, often maybe one	14	Q. If you wanted to keep a source anonymous and not reveal
	of just a few people left at the paper, looking at	15	the source, was that possible?
16	stories on screen, changing headlines. I mean, this	16	A. No. I mean you don't really have too many secrets with
17	is you know, this might even be after the first	17	your editor. I mean, he's the editor. He's your boss.
18	edition has gone. He would sometimes be sitting there	18	He's the one who makes the key decisions. It's so
19	rewriting headlines. You know, in the so-called front	19	you know, it's not a game of you know, you can't try
20	of book, in the first six, eight pages of the newspaper,	20	to pull the wool over anyone's eyes. You have to answer
21	I would see him changing headlines, rewriting copy,	21	all his questions correctly. That's just how it worked.
22	rewriting first paragraphs.	22	And he was good at that.
23	He had that level of involvement. He stamped his	23	Q. Were you aware of any journalist working on the Mirror
24	authority on every single page. As I said, the	24	who did withhold a source from the editor, but informed
25	newspaper was built around the cult of $$ the cult of	25	the editor otherwise of how the story had been obtained?
	Page 29		Page 31
1	Piers. He was the newspaper. You know, he was	1	A. No. I don't think so. I mean, if it comes to
2	extremely hands-on. Nothing happened at the newspaper	2	getting if it comes to a journalist being under
3	without him knowing. He wanted to know about the	3	pressure to reveal a source, then they're not going to
4	details of each story, especially if they were celebrity	4	reveal it, but they are going to reveal it to their
5	stories, and, you know, he wanted to know where they	5	editor. They might not reveal it to anyone else on the
6	came from. Where did this story come from? How do we		
7	know? What's the evidence? The simple questions that	U U	newspaper, but they will almost certainly reveal it to
		7	newspaper, but they will almost certainly reveal it to their editor.
8	· ·	7	their editor.
8	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and	8	their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the
9	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.	8 9	their editor.Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're
9 10	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was	8 9 10	their editor.Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying:
9 10 11	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash	8 9 10 11	their editor.Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying:"Of course reporters can reserve the right to
9 10 11 12	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.	8 9 10 11 12	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would
9 10 11 12 13	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.A. Right.	8 9 10 11 12 13	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they
9 10 11 12 13 14	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.A. Right.Q. They got particularly close scrutiny?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story."
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.A. Right.Q. They got particularly close scrutiny?A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.A. Right.Q. They got particularly close scrutiny?A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.A. Right.Q. They got particularly close scrutiny?A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well.Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories.A. Right.Q. They got particularly close scrutiny?A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. What kind of story is it? Is it an exclusive? How 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not a particularly good source, or it's someone who is
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. What kind of story is it? Is it an exclusive? How interesting is it? The splash is the most obviously, 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not a particularly good source, or it's someone who is deemed unreliable, then, you know, the editor might
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. What kind of story is it? Is it an exclusive? How interesting is it? The splash is the most obviously, by definition, the most important page in a newspaper. 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not a particularly good source, or it's someone who is deemed unreliable, then, you know, the editor might consider that it is not such a good story, he might
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. What kind of story is it? Is it an exclusive? How interesting is it? The splash is the most obviously, by definition, the most important page in a newspaper. Q. Were the sources of your stories things that your editor 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not a particularly good source, or it's someone who is deemed unreliable, then, you know, the editor might consider that it is not such a good story, he might still run it, but he might run it, you know, further
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. What kind of story is it? Is it an exclusive? How interesting is it? The splash is the most obviously, by definition, the most important page in a newspaper. Q. Were the sources of your stories things that your editor wanted to know? 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not a particularly good source, or it's someone who is deemed unreliable, then, you know, the editor might consider that it is not such a good story, he might still run it, but he might run it, you know, further down the newspaper. If it was a great story from a good
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 all editors ask their journalists. That was his job and he did it very well. Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was a particular focus from the editors on the splash stories, the front page stories. A. Right. Q. They got particularly close scrutiny? A. Of course, it's the front page splash, it's the thing that's going to sell your newspaper. It's the thing that the people in the shops who are going to buy your papers see and they often make their decision on whether they are going to buy it from the front page splash. What kind of story is it? Is it an exclusive? How interesting is it? The splash is the most obviously, by definition, the most important page in a newspaper. Q. Were the sources of your stories things that your editor 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 their editor. Q. Can we focus on page 5 of your witness statement, the last sentence in the first paragraph where you're dealing with this topic and you conclude by saying: "Of course reporters can reserve the right to withhold names to protect their sources, but they would still have to convince their editors on what basis they can run with the story." How do you square that with what you've just told us? A. It's up to the editor to decide what to do with a story, and often an editor will decide what to do with it, based on the strength of the source. If it's not a particularly good source, or it's someone who is deemed unreliable, then, you know, the editor might consider that it is not such a good story, he might still run it, but he might run it, you know, further

1	cannot make that decision unless he knows where the	1	job. And that would be made very clear to people by
2	story came from.	2	some of Mr Morgan's emails.
3	Q. Can I just be clear what your evidence is? Is it that	3	I think that's menacing, but then again, you know,
4	a reporter can reserve the right to withhold the name to	4	most tabloid journalists have a pretty tough hide, tough
5	protect a source from the editor or not?	5	skin, and, you know, what might be menacing to other
6	A. They can, but in my experience that doesn't happen very	6	people might not be to a tabloid journalist, but, yeah,
7	often.	7	I'm happy to I stand by that I'm happy with the
8	Q. Can I now turn to what you say generally about cultural	8	description.
9	attitudes and ethical attitudes of reporters? You tell	9	Q. You also tell us in that paragraph that amongst the
10	us that every journalist you've ever met has "come into	10	pressures, one that isn't there is financial because you
11	the profession with a strong sense of wanting to be	11	tell us there's no financial incentive for getting
12	a force for good in society and to hold people in	12	a scoop?
13	positions of power to account, to be a voice for the	13	A. No, not in my experience. You were just paid to be
14	dispossessed and to fight injustice".	14	a journalist on the newspaper. You were paid the same
15	A. Yes.	15	whatever.
16	Q. But it would appear, wouldn't it, that once they move	16	Q. Can I move now back to the share dealing matter?
17	into the real world of work as journalists, that they	17	A. Yes.
18	come under ethical pressures, don't they?	18	Q. I'm looking now at tab 27 of the bundle at another
19	A. Sometimes they do, sometimes they don't. Most as	19	internal printout from the Guardian. This time it's an
20	I have said, most people, I think, come into the	20	article dated 3 May 2001. In this article, according to
21	profession to be a force for good. You certainly don't	21	the introductory paragraph, you've launched a "stinging
22	do it for the money. You do it because it can be highly	22	attack" on the paper's editor, Piers Morgan, and we see
23	enjoyable, can be extremely rewarding, and you can	23	the contents of that. Perhaps if we pick it up at the
24	change people's minds. As I said, most journalists,	24	third paragraph, it says:
25	I think, do go into the profession to be a force for	25	"'In reality, Piers is the one who got off lightly,'
	Page 33		Page 35
1	good and a number of them achieve it.	1	wrote Mr Hipwell.
1 2	good and a number of them achieve it. Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm	1 2	wrote Mr Hipwell. "'There is no difference between what we did and
1 2 3	good and a number of them achieve it.Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say:	1 2 3	"There is no difference between what we did and
2	Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say:	2	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have
2 3	Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm	2 3	"There is no difference between what we did and
2 3 4	Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say:"There is, however, an undeniable pressure to	2 3 4	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his
2 3 4 5	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially 	2 3 4 5 6	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from
2 3 4 5 6	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under 	2 3 4 5 6	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.'
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would 	2 3 4 5 6 7	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	"There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or enough stories, then what use is he to a newspaper? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much larger than anyone else's on the newspaper. With one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or enough stories, then what use is he to a newspaper? This is a highly competitive industry. You can easily be replaced. It takes you years and years to get to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much larger than anyone else's on the newspaper. With one company in one company called Viglen, chaired by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or enough stories, then what use is he to a newspaper? This is a highly competitive industry. You can easily be replaced. It takes you years and years to get to you know, to get onto a national newspaper, very often, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much larger than anyone else's on the newspaper. With one company in one company called Viglen, chaired by Sir Alan Sugar who was then a Mirror columnist himself,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or enough stories, then what use is he to a newspaper? This is a highly competitive industry. You can easily be replaced. It takes you years and years to get to you know, to get onto a national newspaper, very often, and, you know, you don't want to blow it by not pulling 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much larger than anyone else's on the newspaper. With one company in one company called Viglen, chaired by Sir Alan Sugar who was then a Mirror columnist himself, Piers' investment was as large as £67,000.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or enough stories, then what use is he to a newspaper? This is a highly competitive industry. You can easily be replaced. It takes you years and years to get to you know, to get onto a national newspaper, very often, and, you know, you don't want to blow it by not pulling your weight, and the fact is if you don't bring in great 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much larger than anyone else's on the newspaper. With one company in one company called Viglen, chaired by Sir Alan Sugar who was then a Mirror columnist himself, Piers' investment was as large as £67,000.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. The way you describe it in your witness statement, I'm looking at page 7 now, is you say: "There is, however, an undeniable pressure to deliver scoops. Exclusives sell newspapers, especially Sunday newspapers, and every journalist is under pressure to bring them in. For example, Mr Morgan would regularly send out all-staff emails berating his journalists for not bringing in enough exclusives, and these emails would often be quite menacing in tone." Did you hear Mr Morgan's evidence yesterday? A. I think he agreed with it, but said that he had some question mark over the word "menacing". Q. Yes. That's what I want to ask you about. Were the emails menacing in tone? A. Well, some of them undoubtedly were. It was quite common to be threatened with the sack. Frankly, if a journalist doesn't bring in enough exclusives or enough stories, then what use is he to a newspaper? This is a highly competitive industry. You can easily be replaced. It takes you years and years to get to you know, to get onto a national newspaper, very often, and, you know, you don't want to blow it by not pulling 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 "There is no difference between what we did and what he did, save the volume of trading. We might have bought into a few more companies but, in the main, his investments were larger, as you would expect from someone on £300k a year.' "He continued: 'And whereas we got fired for gross misconduct, Piers got editorial control of another newspaper'." Can I take it from that that it's your opinion that Mr Morgan was as guilty as you were, but got away with it? A. I've always thought so. I mean, I can understand why people think that I have an axe to grind against him, but it has always been my contention that neither Trinity Mirror nor Mr Morgan took their responsibility for what happened, so, yes, I think I did trade on the same information that he did. You know, as far as some of the companies went, his investments were very much larger than anyone else's on the newspaper. With one company in one company called Viglen, chaired by Sir Alan Sugar who was then a Mirror columnist himself, Piers' investment was as large as £67,000.

1 horea the abare was tipped by your column? 1 now. It was something we should not have done. And it is right that were had to account. 3 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think we're going to overse had to account. 3 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I waart acculary awas it going to the concept. You were the for account. 6 A. Okay. 6 brought in to start a column. Surrounding that column 7 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I an, however, concerned with over of it all orst of logal ifs and buts, if you like. 8 the underlying issues to this episode, because it bits: 8 A. Yes. 9 on custom, partice and thisk. You said at the start account of for out what the for our own of the regime cought to be. 1 11 the code, you don't recall ever being taught it, but 11 environment, what you did or what you of for out what the for our owner on the accept and the start is a advantue, you diff in owner was a code? 15 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: An you saying that in your time at the inter, and I think weat hop noing in the starts? 16 a journality, you diff in owner was a code? 10 17 A. Nei. A. Weis was not in place of the starts? 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: An you saying that in your times. 15 19 you be apply when advising on the accupits? 10 reartify thri				
3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I vasant actually asking you to 4 reinvestigate this case for masons which are pretty 4 6 A. Okay. 6 7 10RD JUSTICE LEVESON: I ann, however, concerned with own of 7 8 the underlying issues to this episode, because it bites 8 A. Yes. 9 on custom, practice and othics. You said at the 9 10RD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I'm just wondering what you did 10 beginning of your evidnee that you never saw a copy of 10 10 because you way with in hot you you ford out what the 12 Just want opers you pon that, if I might, 11 environment, what you did or what you were asses and/er 13 14 A. Yes. 13 four context way usin in pher for you ford out what the 15 JORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Any you saying that in your time as a journalis, you didri those there was a code? 14 A. We jast wanted in principles which 16 a journalis, you didri those there was a code? 19 syneth thereis of what we were doing. 17 A. No Lading requirements. 19 syneth thereis of what we were doing. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles whith 10 1000D JUSTICE LEVESON: How wer	1	before the share was tipped by your column?	1	now. It was something we should not have done. And it
4 reinvisitgate this case for reasons which are pretty 4 revisit your own personal wongdoing as found by the 5 obvious. 6 New 5 jury, but rather thinking about the concept. You were 6 A. Kay. 7 is all sorts of legal ifs and buts, if you like. 8 7 is all sorts of legal ifs and buts, if you like. 8 A. Yes. 9 on custom, practice and ethics. You said at the 9 DOED JUSTICE LEVESON: And Tri just wondering what you did 10 beginning of your evidence that you never saw a copy of 10 because you'd come from a busines environment, media 11 Mr Hipwell. 11 environment, what you aid or what you avere encourged to be. 14 A. Yes. 10 bocums you'd come from a busines environment, media 15 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Any ous soright in try our time is a cound what you also what you avere encourged to be. 14 A. Yes. 16 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Any ous any out the ready is the encourse out cound was happening in the stock 16 market at the time, and 1 think we did that. I didn't 17 A. Ng. Ident think Idd. I never save a colp. 10 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Any ous any only	2	A. Yes.	2	
5 jury, but rather tinking about the concurs 6 A. Okay. 5 jury, but rather tinking about the concurs 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: 1 an, however, concerned with ore? 7 is all sots of legal if s and buts, if you like. 8 the underlying issues to this episode, because i biles 6 - Nes. 9 or customs, You sold or whar you were encouraged to 10 because you'd come from a business environment, media 11 the code, you don't necall ever being tungt it, hat 11 encourse, what you fild or whar you were encouraged to 12 I you want to press you upon thi. if 1 might. 13 A. Yes. 10 because you'd come from a business environment, media 13 Mr Hipwell. 14 A. Yes. 10 because you'd come from a business environment, media 14 A. Yes. 10 because you'd come from a business environment, media 10 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles witch 14 A. We jury wanted to produce arally lively, introesing 16 a consideration of the india. Infinight, about the chices of what we were doing. 10 DORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 17 A. Ne, lad think 141. Interve sawa a coreliatio	3		3	
6 A. Clay. 6 brought in to start a column. Surrounding that column 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: 1.m., however, concerned with one of subsective the set of sequific and buts, if you like. 8 9 on custom, practice and ethics. You said at the one of some values that you out to be sequine group or videome that you more encouraged to be sequine you do one from a business environment, media 11 the underlying issues to this episode, because value of you of information of your evideome that you out do or what was put in place for you to find out what the di a four orners of the regine couplet to be. 12 T just want to press you upon that. If I might. 11 environment, what you did r what you were encouraged to a of a what was put in place for you to find out what the di a land the link. 13 Mr Higwell. 13 four concerns of the regine cought to be. 14 A. Yes. 14 A. We just vanied to robace a really lively, interesting a a just of did r know there was a cole: 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And you about the principely which a copy what do apply when advising on the acquisition of you devect that you'd har. I didn't a consideration between the two, perhaps a superiors on the newspaper. 20 shares? Raming a City dask or running a City outsour, and the principely which a super discussed. It wasn't a consideration between the two, perhaps a superiors on the newspaper. 21 all about the proprity of your dealing is shares which a super	4	reinvestigate this case for reasons which are pretty	4	
1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: 1 am, however, concerned with one of 7 is all sorts of legal ifs and buts, if you like. 8 the underlying issues to this episode, because if bits 8 A. Yes. 0 on custom, practice and ethics. You said at the 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I'n just wondering what you did 10 because you'd cone from a business environment, media 10 because you'd cone from a business environment, media 11 the code, you don't real uever being anght it, but 11 environment, what you did or what you were encoraged to 12 1 just want to press you upon that, if I might, 12 do or what was put in place for you to find out what the 13 M. Figure M. 14 A. Weil wareal to produce are areally lively, interesting 14 A. Yes. 15 column, which reflected what was happening in the stock 16 a journaling on the acceptant in your time as 15 column, which reflected what was happening in the stock 15 use would expect that you'd the ware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a correlation how even throw or happa 23 all shout the principles of Winn. 24 A. Ves, but that was hever discussed. It wasn't 24 ow were trading requirements. Did you know onting at	5		5	
8 the underlying issues to this episode, because it hites 9 A. Yex. 9 on custom, practice and othics. Yu sud at the 9 DORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And Tm just wondering what you did 11 the code, you don't recall ever being tanght if, but 11 11 environment, what you did or what you were encouraged to 12 Ligst want to press you upon that, if I might, 12 do or what was put in place for you to find out what the 13 M. Higweil. 13 four corners of the regime ought to be. 14 A. Yes. 15 Colt DJUSTICE LEVESON: An eyou saying that in your time as 16 a journalist, you didn't know there was a code? 17 really think about the othics of what we ware doing. 17 A. No, I don't think I did. I never saw a copy. 10 16 Centrally there was no thical management from our 19 you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of 19 superiors on the newspaper. 21 one would expet that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes. 21 Nor Son'the regime ought was the 22 all about the propriet of your dealing in hamas which 22 A. Yee, what thaw sender	6	-		
9 on custom, parcice and ethes. You said at the 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I'm just wondering what you did 10 beginning of your vicknee that you never saw a copy of 10 because you'd come from a business environment, media 12 1 just want to press you upon that, if I might, 12 1 a vicknee 13 Mr Hipwell. 12 4. Yes. 13 four corners of the regime ought to be. 14 A. Yes. 14 A. We just wannot to produce a really lively, interesting 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you saying that in your time as 15 column, which reflected what was happening in the stock 16 a journalist, you didt A indidt 1 or would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 10 20 shares? Running a City deak or running a City column, 21 IORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 13 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 23 al about the projecty of your dealing in shares which 21 not alway, but sometimes. 21 not alway, but sometimes. 24 you were mentioning in your column? 24 a consideration. I should hare been, but wasn't. <td< td=""><td>7</td><td></td><td>f 7</td><td></td></td<>	7		f 7	
10 beginning of your evidence that you never saw a copy of 10 because you'd come from a business environment, media 11 the code, you don't recall ever being taught it, but 11 environment, Mad you did or what you mere encouraged to 12 Lipits want to pross you upon that, if I might, 11 environment, Mad you did or what you mere encouraged to 13 Mr Hipwell. 14 A. Yes. 14 A. We just wanted to produce a really lively, interesting 14 A. Yes. 14 A. We just wanted to produce a really lively, interesting 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 18 Certainly there was no ethical management from oar 19 you had rapply when advising on the acquisition of 19 superiors on the newspaper. 10 one would expect that you'd be wave, for example, of 10 DISUTICE LEVESON: Its no tjust ethics, it's law. 21 all about the propriet of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 23 a. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who 24 a obar entiphing in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but wasn't	8		8	
11 the code, you don't recall ever being taught it, but 11 environment, what you did or what you were encouraged to 12 1 Just want to press you upon that, if 1 might, 12 do or what was put in place for you to find out what the 13 Mr Hipwell. 13 for correns of the regime ought to be. 14 A. Yes. 14 A. We just wanted to produce a regime ought to be. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And you saying that in your time as 16 market at the time, and 1 think we did that. I did.t 17 A. No, 1 don't think 1 did. Inever saw a code? 17 really think about the ethiss of what we were doing. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles with 18 Certainly there was no ethical management from our 19 you have mentioning in your columns? 10 DORD JUSTICE LEVESON: 18 hou just ethics, it's law. 23 al about the propricy of your dealing in shares which 24 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a conserial the registro were some some sorelian column before. So when you 23 al about the propricy of your dealing in shares which 2 were brought in to start this column, did you raise the 2 a shar	9	-	9	
12 Tjust want to press you upon that, if I might, 12 do or what was put in place for you to find out what the 13 Mr Hpwell. 13 four corners of the regime ought to be. 14 A. Yes. 14 A. Yes. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you saying that in your time as injournalist, you didn't how the was a code? 16 market at the time, and 1 think weid that. I didn't 17 A. No, I doin't think I did. In never saw a code? 16 market at the time, and 1 think were doing. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 18 Certainly there was no ethical management from our 19 space status you'd be avare, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 21 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 23 all about the propricy of you claing in shares which 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who Page 37 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 week I quietly	10		10	-
13 Mr Hipwell. 13 four corners of the regime ought to be. 14 A. Yes. 14 A. Yes. 15 LORD JUSTCE LEVESON: Are you saying that in your time as i journalist, you didn't know there was a copy. 14 A. We just wanted to produce a really lively, interesting 16 a journalist, you didn't know there was a copy. 15 CoRD JUSTCE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 17 A. No, I don't think I did. Thever saw a copy. 16 market at the time, and I think we weet doing. 19 you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of the aware, for stample, of aniser which 18 Certainly there was a corellation between the two, perhaps 21 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at alabout the propriety of your claims in shares which 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 23 all about the propriety of your claims in shares which 22 10 24 24 No. I don't a lisk was net 24 you were mentioning in your columns, 27 24 24 10 Oviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you were brought in to start this column, did you raise the frame on the page had been of your days late, Piers 3 obviously hadn't had such a columan before. So when you were brought in to star				
14 A. Yes. 14 A. We just wanted to produce a really lively, interesting 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you saying that in your time as 15 column, which reflected what was happening in the stock 17 A. No, I don't think I did. I never saw a code? 16 market at the time, and I think we did that. I did/t 17 A. No, I don't think I did. I never saw a code? 17 really thick about the ethics of what we were doing. 20 Shares? Running a City desk or running a City column. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I's not just ethics, it's law. 21 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 22 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasnt. 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasnt. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 1 obviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you as share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 1 obviously hadn't had such a column, did you raise the 3 first few months after we launched the column, my 4 boces were going to have to tick on all this' or not? 5	12	I just want to press you upon that, if I might,	12	
15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you saying that in your time as journalist, you didn't know there was a code? 15 column, which reflected what was happening in the stock in anaket at the time, and I think we did that. I didn't 17 A. No, I don't hink I did. I never saw a copy. 17 really think about the ethics of what we were doing. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 18 Certainly there was no othical management from our 19 you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of 19 superiors on the newspaper. 20 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 21 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes. 23 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who 2 a starc-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 1 obviously hadn't had suct to a column before. So when you 2 week I quietly dropped	13	Mr Hipwell.	13	
16 a journalist, you didn't know there was a code? 16 market at the time, and I think we did that. I didn't 17 A. No, I don't think I did. I never saw a copy. 17 really think about the entioples which 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 18 Certainly there was no ethical management from our 19 you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of 19 superiors on the newspaper. 20 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 21 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 22 not always, but sometimes. 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, thusn't 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who 2 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 question, "Well, we have some things were going to 4 co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that 4 boxes we're going to have to tick on all this'' or not? 5	14	A. Yes.	14	A. We just wanted to produce a really lively, interesting
17 A. No, I don't think I did. I never saw a copy. 17 really think about the ethics of what we were doing. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles witch 18 Certainly there was no ethical management from our 20 shares? Running a City desk or running a City column, 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Is not just ethics, it's law. 21 one would expect that you'b the aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 22 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 7 Page 37 7 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 question, "Well, we have to tick on all this" or not? 4 co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that 5 A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the 6 main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within 7 put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like	15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you saying that in your time as	15	column, which reflected what was happening in the stock
18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which 18 Certainly there was no ethical management from our 19 you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of 19 superiors on the newspaper. 20 shares? Running a City desk or running a City column, 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just ethics, it's law. 21 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were remotioning in your columns? 24 a considention. It should have been, but it wasn't 25 A. Well, we meren't regulated to give investment advice. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who 2 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 question, "Well, we have some things were going to4 5 week I quietly dropped it from the column. Within 3 question, "Well, we have some things were going to4 6 main share tip, 1 dropped it from the column. Within 4 boxes were going to have to tick on all this' or not? 7 the stare week marybe three or four days la	16	a journalist, you didn't know there was a code?	16	market at the time, and I think we did that. I didn't
19 you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of 19 superiors on the newspaper. 20 shares? Running a City desk or running a City column. 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just ethics, it's law. 21 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just ethics, it's law. 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 Page 39 11 It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 26 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 question, "Well, we have some things we're going to - 35 week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the 6 Mirror's in-house lawayer, the possibility that we should 7 the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 6 Mirror's in-house lawayer, the possibility that we should 7 put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like 0 dother financial publications do. Investors Chronicle.	17	A. No, I don't think I did. I never saw a copy.	17	really think about the ethics of what we were doing.
20 shares? Running a City desk or running a City column, 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just ethics, it's law. 21 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a corelation between the two, perhaps 22 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 22 not always, but sometimes. 23 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 24 2 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 ashare-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 first few months after we launched the column, my co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that 5 5 week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the 6 Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should 7 the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 6 Mirror's in -house lawyer, the possibility that we should 7 feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 0 edse this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in	18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And what about the principles which	18	Certainly there was no ethical management from our
21 one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of 21 There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps 22 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 24 27 not always, but sometimes. 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 25 1 It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 3 3 question, "Well, we have some things we're going to - boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not? 4 were k rought opped it from the column, my 4 boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not? 5 week I quietly dropped it from the column. Within 6 Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should 7 feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 10 companies they write about. You used to be able to see 11 It's also significant that this column was produced 14 c	19	you had to apply when advising on the acquisition of	19	superiors on the newspaper.
22 insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at 22 not always, but sometimes. 23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 26 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who Page 37 27 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 1 obviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you were brought in to start this column, did you raise the 3 question, "Well, we have some things we're going to - 4 boxes we're going to have some things we're going to - 4 co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that 6 Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should 7 the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 7 put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like 8 care to the desk. He had spotted that this particular 8 other financial publications do. Investors Chronicle 10 reinstate it, which I did. 11 <td< td=""><td>20</td><td>shares? Running a City desk or running a City column,</td><td>20</td><td>LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just ethics, it's law.</td></td<>	20	shares? Running a City desk or running a City column,	20	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just ethics, it's law.
23 all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which 23 A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't 24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we were'n regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 26 A. Well, we were'n regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 27 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the a share tip, I dropped the tip of the day, which was the obviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you 2 a share tip, I dropped it from the column, my 4 obviously hadn't had such a column, did you raise the 3 main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within 5 A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the 6 main share tip, I dropped it from the column. ways broteced it from the same week, mays be three or four days later, Piers 6 Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should 9 feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 10 companies they write about. You used to be able to see 11 the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to 11 His response, and I think he was certainly 12 do a column like that now. We were seeing these 11 His response, and I think he was tha	21	one would expect that you'd be aware, for example, of	21	There's sometimes a correlation between the two, perhaps
24 you were mentioning in your columns? 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 26 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. Page 37 24 a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't. 27 It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did. 5 A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in companies they write about. You used to be able to see it it in the Investors Chronicle. Not now, I haven't read it for a while. 13 the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to do a column like that now. We were seeing these for companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later for zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into. 10 His response, and I think he was certainly in ot carry that disclosure. You can read that from the transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did race not regulated to give investment advice and we will not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did ra real public app	22	insider trading requirements. Did you know nothing at	22	not always, but sometimes.
25 A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who 26 Page 37 Page 39 1 It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 1 obviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you 2 a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 1 obviously hadn't had such a column, did you raise the 3 first few months after we launched the column, my 4 ouestion, "Well, we have some things we're going to - 4 co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that 5 A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the 6 main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within 6 Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should 7 the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 7 outer financial publications do. Investors Chronicle 9 feature on the page had been dropped and asked meto 10 companies they write about. You used to be able to see 11 It's also significant that this column was produced 11 it for a while. 11 13 the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to 13 His respones, and I think he was certainly 14 <td>23</td> <td>all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which</td> <td>23</td> <td>A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't</td>	23	all about the propriety of your dealing in shares which	23	A. Yes, but that was never discussed. It wasn't
Page 37Page 391It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the 31obviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you were brought in to start this column, did you raise the question, "Well, we have some things we're going to boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not?4co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within 74boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not?5week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the 65A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the 66main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within 76Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should 77put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like 8came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular 88other financial publications do. Investors Chronicle9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 9does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in 101010reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see 111114do a column like that now. We were seeing these 1413His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these 1513His response, and I think he was certainly16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later 1616are not regulated to give investment advice and we will 17 <td>24</td> <td>you were mentioning in your columns?</td> <td>24</td> <td>a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't.</td>	24	you were mentioning in your columns?	24	a consideration. It should have been, but it wasn't.
1It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be2a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the3first few months after we launched the column, my4co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that5week I quietly dropped it from the column. Within7the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers8came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to10reinstate it, which I did.11It's also significant that this column was produced12at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to14do a column like that now. We were seeing these15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. Three was19a real public appetite for it, and that - the20zeigeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.21I think we did it very well.22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to23sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologise24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologise25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise26then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise	25	A. Well, we weren't regulated to give investment advice.	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You had to cope with people who
2a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the first few months after we launched the column, my co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 8 came to the desk. He had spotted that his particular 9 feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.2were brought in to start this column, did you raise the question, "Well, we have some things we're going to 		Page 37		Page 39
2a share-tipping column. Actually, you know, in the first few months after we launched the column, my co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 8 came to the desk. He had spotted that his particular 9 feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.2were brought in to start this column, did you raise the question, "Well, we have some things we're going to boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not?7week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.2were brought in to start this column, did you raise the question, "Well, we have some things we're going to boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not?8came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.3No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the Mirro's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like other financial publications do. Investors Chronicle to a column like that now. We were seeing these to a column like that now. We were seeing these to a column like that now. We were seeing these to a column like that now. We were seeing these they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People a real public appetite for it, and that the zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.211It's true to say that we got car	1	It's true to say that initially I did not want it to be	1	obviously hadn't had such a column before. So when you
3first few months after we launched the column, my3question, "Well, we have some things we're going to4co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that4boxes we're going to have to tick on all this" or not?5week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the6Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should7put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like68came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular7put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to9oother financial publications do. Investors Chronicle10reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see11It's also significant that this column was produced11it for a while.12at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on12it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to13His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We15not degritalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.21LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON:				
4co-columnist Mr Bhoyrul went on holiday. During that4boxes we're going to have to tick on all this' or not?5week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the6Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should7the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers7A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the8came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular7boxes we're going to have to tick on all this' or not?9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to7does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in10reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see11It's also significant that this column was produced11it for a while.12at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on12it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to14cross-examined in my trial about this, was that we're15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did				•
5week I quietly dropped the tip of the day, which was the main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers a came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.5A. No, I didn't. I did raise with Mr Cruddace, the Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like other financial publications do. Investors Chronicle does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in companies they write about. You used to be able to see 1111It's also significant that this column was produced 1211it in the Investors Chronicle. Not now, I haven't read it in the Investors Chronicle. Not now, I haven't read it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People a real public appetite for it, and that the zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.16Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We are not regulated to give investment advice and we will not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did raise it with him. I did 2021It hink we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded more enthusiastically than we should. The extremely sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to culture and practice rather than the specifics of this incident.24 <td></td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td>		•		
6main share tip, I dropped it from the column. Within the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers a came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular 96Mirror's in-house lawyer, the possibility that we should put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like 88came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular 9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 107does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in 1010reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see 1111It's also significant that this column was produced at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on 1312it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to 1413His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later 1513His response, and I think he was certainly17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People a real public appetite for it, and that the 2019raise it with him. I did20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded 322LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to 323more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely 423culture and practice rather than the specifics of this 324sorry and regretful that that hap				
7the same week, maybe three or four days later, Piers 87put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like 88came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular 9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 107put in a disclosure at the bottom of the page, like 89feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to 109does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in 1010reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see 1111It's also significant that this column was produced at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on 1310companies they write about. You used to be able to see 1113the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later 1713His response, and I think he was certainly 1416are not regulated to give investment advice and we will 17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the 1818were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was 19a real public appetite for it, and that the 201920zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wated to tap into. 2110LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it? 2121It strue to say that we got carried away, we traded 23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely 232324sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
8came to the desk. He had spotted that this particular 98other financial publications do. Investors Chronicle9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see 1110reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see 1111It's also significant that this column was produced at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on 1310it in the Investors Chronicle. Not now, I haven't read 1213the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People13His response, and I think he was certainly16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later they were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was 2 zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.10LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded 3 more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely 4 sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologised25Right, thank you.				
9feature on the page had been dropped and asked me to reinstate it, which I did.9does this. Our journalists sometimes own shares in companies they write about. You used to be able to see11It's also significant that this column was produced at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on do a column like that now. We were seeing these11it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People13His response, and I think he was certainly16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.		• •		
10reinstate it, which I did.10companies they write about. You used to be able to see11It's also significant that this column was produced11it in the Investors Chronicle. Not now, I haven't read12at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on12it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to13His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these14cross-examined in my trial about this, was that we're15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. Three was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that th				-
11It's also significant that this column was produced11it in the Investors Chronicle. Not now, I haven't read12at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on12it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to13His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these14cross-examined in my trial about this, was that we're15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				-
12at a time when there was the most incredible bull run on the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to do a column like that now. We were seeing these12it for a while.13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to do a column like that now. We were seeing these13His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these14cross-examined in my trial about this, was that we're15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24nicident. <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· ·</td>				· ·
13the stock market. I don't think it would be possible to do a column like that now. We were seeing these13His response, and I think he was certainly14do a column like that now. We were seeing these14cross-examined in my trial about this, was that we're15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				
14do a column like that now. We were seeing these14cross-examined in my trial about this, was that we're15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				
15companies come to the market capitalised at just a few hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was a real public appetite for it, and that the zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.15not the Investors Chronicle, we're the Daily Mirror. We are not regulated to give investment advice and we will not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.		_		· · ·
16hundred thousand pounds one week. Three months later they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was a real public appetite for it, and that the zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.16are not regulated to give investment advice and we will not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to culture and practice rather than the specifics of this25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				-
17they were capitalised at 10, 15 million pounds. People17not carry that disclosure. You can read that from the18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.		· · · ·		•
18were trying to acquire these Internet stocks. There was a real public appetite for it, and that the18transcript of his evidence during my trial. But I did19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				•
19a real public appetite for it, and that the19raise it with him. I did20zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into.19LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?21I think we did it very well.20LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it?22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded21A. Yes.23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				-
 20 zeitgeist, if you will, is what we wanted to tap into. 21 I think we did it very well. 22 It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded 23 more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely 24 sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised 25 then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what he said, is it? 21 A. Yes. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to 23 culture and practice rather than the specifics of this 24 incident. 25 Right, thank you. 				
21I think we did it very well.21A. Yes.22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to23more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely23culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.				
22It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised22LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to culture and practice rather than the specifics of this24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologised23incident.25Right, thank you.25Right, thank you.				
 more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise Right, thank you. 		I think we did it verv well.		
24sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised24incident.25then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise25Right, thank you.	21	-	22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. As I say, it goes to
25 then in the pages of the Press Gazette and I apologise 25 Right, thank you.	21 22	It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded		
	21 22 23	It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely	23	culture and practice rather than the specifics of this
	21 22 23 24	It's true to say that we got carried away, we traded more enthusiastically than we should. I'm extremely sorry and regretful that that happened. I apologised	23 24	culture and practice rather than the specifics of this incident.

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

1	MR BARR: The question I was going to put to you about your	1	do it himself, but I certainly did to some of the
2	feelings towards Mr Morgan, him having got away with	2	clients that I managed whilst I worked for him.
3	something, is	3	Q. In dealing with the tabloids on behalf of your clients,
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could you pause a moment? The		how important was copy approval?
5	transcription system has failed.	5	A. Whilst I worked for Max?
6	Just a few minutes early, let's have a little break.	6	Q. Yes.
7	(11.07 am)	7	A. Max does his own thing. He you know, he
8	(A short break)	8	I wouldn't necessarily know everything that he got up
9	(11.18 am)	9	to. I mean, certainly there were instances when copy
10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just before we start, are you	10	approval was required. I think that's pretty common, in
11	satisfied that we've captured everything that we've done	11	publicity agents' offices; it was then and I'm sure it
12	to date? Thank you. If this happens again, please	12	is now, but again, I worked mainly on Max's corporate
13	don't wait for some break, say something.	13	clients, people in business who came to him and wanted
14	Yes, Mr Barr.	14	help with a problem. There was a lot of crisis
15	MR BARR: Thank you, sir. I'm touching wood when I say we	15	management.
16	think all the problems are sorted out now. We	16	I worked on, to give you an example, the account of
17	understand there was a power problem.	17	a personal injury insurer which had been all over the
18	I'm almost finished, Mr Hipwell. I was asking	18	Sun and also featured on the consumer programme
19 20	whether your beliefs about Mr Morgan and that he got	19	Watchdog, and I would provide advice to his corporate
20	away with something, have they influenced the evidence	20	clients, of which there were maybe five or six, whilst
21	that you have given about him in any way?	21	I worked there. Max concentrated on the big
22 23	A. No. I don't spend my life thinking about Mr Morgan.It's a long time ago now, it's 12 years ago. I've had	22	showbusiness exclusives and buy-ups and that kind of
23 24	two major organ transplants since I left the Mirror,	23 24	thing, and he would obviously help people to market
24 25	I've moved on with my life. I do not really think about	24	their story if they walked into his office, he would
23	Page 41	23	often negotiate for them and I think his advice was Page 43
1	my time at the Mirror. I'm not obsessed with getting	1	normally excellent.
1 2	my time at the Mirror. I'm not obsessed with getting back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging	1 2	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions.
	back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very		MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure
2	back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there.	2	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne?
2 3 4 5	back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed	2 3	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not
2 3 4	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that 	2 3 4 5 6	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could
2 3 4 5 6 7	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not 	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there.But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information to any of his clients, including Simon Cowell, about his 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am concerned with.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information to any of his clients, including Simon Cowell, about his mobile phone. There might have been other people in the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am concerned with. MR BROWNE: Indeed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information to any of his clients, including Simon Cowell, about his mobile phone. There might have been other people in the office who did. I think I did myself to some of our 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am concerned with. MR BROWNE: Indeed. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Although there are two features which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information to any of his clients, including Simon Cowell, about his mobile phone. There might have been other people in the office who did. I think I did myself to some of our clients. I don't think Max did, and obviously Max's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am concerned with. MR BROWNE: Indeed. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Although there are two features which do concern me and which I do think are relevant. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information to any of his clients, including Simon Cowell, about his mobile phone. There might have been other people in the office who did. I think I did myself to some of our clients. I don't think Max did, and obviously Max's phone was hacked, his own phone was hacked, so he can't 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am concerned with. MR BROWNE: Indeed. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Although there are two features which do concern me and which I do think are relevant. The first is the observation of Mr Justice Beatson, who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 back at him. As I've said, I think he was an engaging and charming character, and I thought he was a very talented editor whilst I was there. But when what happened happened, he displayed characteristics that personal characteristics that I do not like in people, moral cowardice. He did not face up to what happened, he did not take his share of responsibility, and that is part of my evidence. So, yes, he did not take responsibility for what happened. Neither did Trinity Mirror, and obviously my evidence should be seen in that light. Q. Can I ask you finally now about your time working for Max Clifford? A. Yes. Q. During the time that you worked for Max Clifford, was advice given to clients to take protective measures to prevent their phones being hacked? A. I can I don't think Max personally gave information to any of his clients, including Simon Cowell, about his mobile phone. There might have been other people in the office who did. I think I did myself to some of our clients. I don't think Max did, and obviously Max's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 MR BARR: Thank you. Those were all my questions. Discussion re procedure LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Mr Browne? MR BROWNE: Sir, as last night with Mr Morgan, who is not directly my client, I've considered whether I could assist the Inquiry by seeking leave under Rule 10 to cross-examine Mr Hipwell. I won't speculate as to what ruling you would have made if I had done that, but I do want to explain, and it's only fair to my clients that I should take a minute or two to do so, why, notwithstanding that we do not accept Mr Hipwell's evidence, we do not think it productive to challenge it by extensive cross-examination. It would hold up the progress of the Inquiry and it could very easily lead into the "you did", "I didn't" form of cross-examination. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You will have gathered from what I said that the precise detail was not what I am concerned with. MR BROWNE: Indeed. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Although there are two features which do concern me and which I do think are relevant. The

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

1	and away the best position to reach conclusions which he	1	and I anticipate that whether that reasoning stands up
2	did, and secondly, the overall question of the way in	2	may be relevant to what is considered about the way in
3	which the column was set up and, as it were, managed	3	which the PCC has conducted itself. But I'm not going
4	legally in line with the questions that I myself asked.	4	to come and look at this or reinvestigate or reconsider
5	So those seem to me to be relevant to the issues	5	the DTI investigation or anything to do with it.
6	that I must address, rather than the specific detail.	6	MR BROWNE: Well, I think, with respect, it's only fair that
7	I hope that's helpful to what you wanted to say. It may	7	one should say publicly on behalf of Mr Morgan, who was
8	not be.	8	subjected to that line of cross-examination, that the
9	MR BROWNE: Well, it is, sir, and it's why we've reached the	9	PCC's conclusion in deciding not to reopen their 2000
10	conclusion that it is best addressed by our giving	10	investigation was that there didn't appear to be any
11	evidence when our time comes, focusing on those matters.	11	evidence to support the contention that the motive for
12	But it has not been easy for the core participants to	12	not revealing the higher figure was to try to protect
13	know how to proceed in this matter.	13	Mr Morgan or to minimise the Commission's criticisms.
14	To take an example, this morning Mr Barr gently led	14	Now
15	from Mr Hipwell the allegation that Mr Morgan was guilty	15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that.
16	of an offence. That was something investigated over	16	MR BROWNE: Thank you.
17	many years, I think four years, by the DTI inspectors,	17	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I go further, Mr Browne. I know
18	and no proceedings were brought. Now, that wasn't put	18	that that will be online and I know that the very
19	to Mr Morgan, and yet it was led out of him before the	19	detailed statement that Mr Morgan made about
20	adjournment by reference to something that Mr Hipwell	20	Mr Hipwell's evidence is itself part of the evidence in
21	had said, I think, to the Guardian, and it was returned	21	the Inquiry, so I'm very conscious of that.
22	to by Mr Barr again when we sat after the breakdown in	22	MR BROWNE: Indeed, and that is important because, of
23	the transcription system was cured.	23	course, when Mr Morgan tried to refer to it, perhaps not
24	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think that's when I interrupted.	24	surprisingly he was told that he wasn't the one making
25	MR BROWNE: Well, I'm not capable of entirely accurate	25	speeches or asking questions, but for me at any rate
20	Page 45		Page 47
1	telepathy, but if your Lordship was as concerned as	1	what is critical, which has not been challenged by
1		1	
2	I was at that stage, it would only be natural.	2	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from
	I was at that stage, it would only be natural. Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was		counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter
2		2	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from
2 3	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was	2 3	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter
2 3 4	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was	2 3 4	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we
2 3 4 5	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total	2 3 4 5	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with
2 3 4 5 6	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and	2 3 4 5 6	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we
2 3 4 5 6 7	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser	2 3 4 5 6 7	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the figure in reality was 67,000 rather than 20,000, they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is inquisitorial and I understand the point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the figure in reality was 67,000 rather than 20,000, they withheld it from the PCC because, to use their words	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is inquisitorial and I understand the point.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the figure in reality was 67,000 rather than 20,000, they withheld it from the PCC because, to use their words recorded in the PCC ruling, that was almost a touchstone	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is inquisitorial and I understand the point. MR BROWNE: It's inquisitorial, and for those acting for core participants it leads to some difficult and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the figure in reality was 67,000 rather than 20,000, they withheld it from the PCC because, to use their words recorded in the PCC ruling, that was almost a touchstone of the veracity of Messrs Bhoyrul and Hipwell	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is inquisitorial and I understand the point. MR BROWNE: It's inquisitorial, and for those acting for core participants it leads to some difficult and delicate decisions as to how they should pursue matters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the figure in reality was 67,000 rather than 20,000, they withheld it from the PCC because, to use their words recorded in the PCC ruling, that was almost a touchstone of the veracity of Messrs Bhoyrul and Hipwell LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, my concern about this is nothing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 3	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is inquisitorial and I understand the point. MR BROWNE: It's inquisitorial, and for those acting for core participants it leads to some difficult and delicate decisions as to how they should pursue matters with witnesses and it's on that account that I wanted it to be known publicly and beyond this tribunal why it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Similarly, yesterday with Mr Morgan, he was cross-examined at some length by Mr Jay as to why it was that the PCC were not told initially that the total holdings of him and his wife in Viglen were 67,000 and were led to believe that it was the acknowledged lesser figure of 20,000. Now, the explanation for all of that is copied in the very document Mr Barr referred to, the 2006 ruling of 7 May, which I think in your bundle is tab 6. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. MR BROWNE: I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to read that, but it demonstrates, first of all, that Trinity Mirror and Mr Morgan were open with the DTI inspectors about the 67,000 figure from the start, but believing that they had been lied to by Mr Bhoyrul and Mr Hipwell and that knowledge of the fact that the figure in reality was 67,000 rather than 20,000, they withheld it from the PCC because, to use their words recorded in the PCC ruling, that was almost a touchstone of the veracity of Messrs Bhoyrul and Hipwell LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, my concern about this is nothing to do with the Trinity Mirror, I say immediately. My	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 counsel to the Inquiry, indeed quite the contrary from the evidence led from Mr Hipwell, is that the matter was, as Mr Morgan says in paragraph 29 of his second witness statement, never raised at the time with Mr Morgan or with senior managers, and now of course we are 12 years down the track, only one of about a dozen people who are embraced in Mr Hipwell's charges has been named, Mr Hughes, and we know from him that he has explicitly denied it. Now, I think that's all I want to say, save this. Yesterday, and this explains why I've risen to expand our thinking and our position, Mr Sherborne made the point in relation to Mr Nott's evidence that it had not been challenged by Trinity Mirror. That's a fair point in adversarial litigation. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the point that you are about to make. This is not adversarial, this is inquisitorial and I understand the point. MR BROWNE: It's inquisitorial, and for those acting for core participants it leads to some difficult and delicate decisions as to how they should pursue matters with witnesses and it's on that account that I wanted it

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

1	own account an acknowledged liar. It is remarkable that	1	you were at the Daily Mirror and then you moved to the
2	it is led by him from Mr Barr that he understands the	2	Daily Express in 2003; is that correct?
3	importance of telling the truth on oath in the light of	3	A. That's correct.
4	what happened at the Crown Court and it must be the	4	Q. I think you are still at the Daily Express as a general
5	first time in history that any courtroom in this	5	news reporter; is that right?
6	building has heard as evidence what is described by the	6	A. That's right.
7	witness as mere buzz.	7	Q. In relation to the Madeleine McCann story, you tell us
8	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Browne, just on that topic,	8	that you went to Portugal in 2007, indeed you were there
9	I think that it's not entirely fair to characterise some	9	a total of six times until February 2008, and you were
10	of the all the evidence I've heard as lacking	10	six weeks in the country at your first visit; is that
11	credibility, albeit I must recognise and allow for the	11	correct?
12	fact that courts and investigators have examined various	12	A. Yes, that's correct, six weeks, yeah.
13	of these transactions in the past and reached	13	Q. Can I ask you first of all, please, in your own words to
14	conclusions on far more evidence than I will ever have	14	tell us about the "uniquely challenging" aspects of
15	and could ever obtain unless this Inquiry were to	15	covering this story? It's paragraph 4 of your
16	proceed for an eternity.	16	statement. I'm not going to ask you to read it out, but
17	MR BROWNE: Sir, you will recall that "buzz" was the phrase	17	to tell us why it was uniquely challenging.
18	used in relation to the suggestion that the story about	18	A. Well, it was obviously a story of great interest and the
19	Ulrika Jonsson had involved a phone hack. I wasn't	19	problem was sort of accessing information from the
20	using "buzz" to describe all of Mr Hipwell's evidence,	20	police because of the secrecy of justice laws, which
21	I was simply reminding you about what he said about that	21	meant that it was illegal for them to discuss any
22	part of his evidence related to phone hacking.	22	details of the case or the investigation. Normally in
23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We've actually had it both ways,	23	a story like that, you would expect the police to be
24	haven't we? Because yesterday we had Ms Marshall and	24	organising appeals and they'd have a strategy of dealing
25	Mr Morgan moving away from positive assertions in	25	with the media and the press. But it wasn't there in
	Page 49		Page 51
1	material they had written to saying, well, it was only	1	this case.
2	rumour. This morning we've had it the other way around.	2	Q. They didn't have a formal strategy because under
3	MR BROWNE: Thank you.	3	Portuguese law it was forbidden to speak to the press;
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much, Mr Browne	4	is that correct?
5	Thank you, Mr Hipwell.	5	A. That's right.
6	A. Thank you.	6	Q. Then you tell us in the final sentence of paragraph 4:
7	MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Mr Pilditch.	7	
8			"Quite frankly this was a ludicrous state of affairs
	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.	8	which made covering the story near impossible."
9	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn)	8 9	
9 10	-		which made covering the story near impossible."
	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn)	9	which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct.
10	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name.	9 10	which made covering the story near impossible."A. That's correct.Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter
10 11	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch.	9 10 11	which made covering the story near impossible."A. That's correct.Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by
10 11 12	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under	9 10 11 12	which made covering the story near impossible."A. That's correct.Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that?A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian
10 11 12 13 14 15	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and	9 10 11 12 13	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this	 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find,
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? 	 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes.	 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something about yourself. You have been a journalist for 26 years	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect that the primary information would be coming from the
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something about yourself. You have been a journalist for 26 years now; is that correct?	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect that the primary information would be coming from the police, and in this case that just wasn't happening, so
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something about yourself. You have been a journalist for 26 years now; is that correct? A. That's correct.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect that the primary information would be coming from the police, and in this case that just wasn't happening, so you are in an impossible situation because obviously
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something about yourself. You have been a journalist for 26 years now; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. You started at a local paper, you were formally trained	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect that the primary information would be coming from the police, and in this case that just wasn't happening, so you are in an impossible situation because obviously you're trying to do everything to make sure that you can
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something about yourself. You have been a journalist for 26 years now; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. You started at a local paper, you were formally trained by the National Council for the Training of Journalists.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect that the primary information would be coming from the police, and in this case that just wasn't happening, so you are in an impossible situation because obviously you're trying to do everything to make sure that you can get to the bottom of what's happened to
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR DAVID PILDITCH (sworn) Questions by MR JAY MR JAY: Please sit down, Mr Pilditch, make yourself comfortable and tell us your full name. A. David Hamilton Pilditch. Q. You'll find in the bundle in front of you, I hope under tab 2, your witness statement has been signed and contains a statement of truth. Do you stand by this evidence? A. Yes. Q. I'm going to ask you first of all to tell us something about yourself. You have been a journalist for 26 years now; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. You started at a local paper, you were formally trained	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 which made covering the story near impossible." A. That's correct. Q. Did you mean by that getting to the truth of the matter or did you mean by that well, what did you mean by that? A. Getting to the truth, yes. I mean, it was as if you'd been transported like Dr Who into some Orwellian nightmare where the truth is impossible to find. Q. It might be said if the truth is impossible to find, a journalist cannot properly say anything? A. Well, that's right, because certainly in relation to the police investigation, in a story like this you'd expect that the primary information would be coming from the police, and in this case that just wasn't happening, so you are in an impossible situation because obviously you're trying to do everything to make sure that you can

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

1	do that job that the police would normally do.	1	information, but you tell us in paragraph 13:
2	Q. Did you feel under any pressure to produce stories in	2	"My stories were compiled using numerous sources of
3	relation to this case?	3	information."
4	A. There was obviously a lot of pressure because there was	4	Can we just list, please, your sources of
5	newspapers and TV networks from all over Britain and	5	information? You say first of all:
6	Europe there, and the interest was in the story. You've	6	"I interviewed witnesses, many locals connected with
7	obviously got to you can't sort of not cover the	7	businesses, resort workers, holidaymakers and expats."
8	story of something that that's why I'm saying it's	8	What information did they give you which bore on the
9	ludicrous, because you have to be in a position to cover	9	Madeleine McCann story which was relevant?
10	the story. That's in everybody's interest.	10	A. Well, the police had been round the resort and other
11	Q. You're making it sound, maybe this is the case, that you	11	areas on their own enquiries, and we were finding out
12	were on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand you	12	lines of enquiry that the police were pursuing through
13	were under pressure to cover the story; on the other	13	speaking to local people and they'd been given
14	hand you couldn't cover it because you couldn't get to	14	descriptions of potential suspects, things like that,
15	the truth. Is that a fair characterisation?	15	and you'd get a whole load of witnesses giving you the
16	A. That's right. But you want to make sure, as	16	same description, then you have a pretty good idea what
17	a journalist, that you've got facts and proper	17	the police are working on, and then you go to the police
18	information that you're dealing with, but without the	18	and they can't tell you if that's right or wrong.
19	police co-operation it's impossible to do that.	19	Q. So the suspects, are these people who were suspected of
20	Q. You say in paragraph 6:	20	having abducted Madeleine; is that right?
21	"The lack of official cooperation between the police	21	A. I think that's right, yes. I mean, the police were
22	and the media in my view fatally flawed the	22	putting out a description of a particular man that
23	investigation into Madeleine's disappearance from day	23	they I think witnesses had described being near the
24	one."	24	apartment, a potential suspect.
25	A. Yes.	25	Q. Okay. And what about the locals connected with
	Page 53		Page 55
1	Q. Why do you say that?	1	businesses? Is this the same sort of enquiry you were
1 2	Q. Why do you say that?A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no	1 2	businesses? Is this the same sort of enquiry you were making?
2	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no	2	making?
2 3	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies	2 3	making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early
2 3 4	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were	2 3 4	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on
2 3 4 5	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important	2 3 4 5	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in
2 3 4 5 6	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that	2 3 4 5 6	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation,	2 3 4 5 6 7	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew.Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew.Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew.Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor?A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew.Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor?A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	making?A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew.Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor?A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just repeating A. That was the story that we were writing in the early stages. The story about the confusion, about the lack 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official spokesman, which we know about. Paragraph 18:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just repeating A. That was the story that we were writing in the early stages. The story about the confusion, about the lack of information. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official spokesman, which we know about. Paragraph 18: "In addition to quoting from Portuguese newspapers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just repeating A. That was the story that we were writing in the early stages. The story about the confusion, about the lack of information. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm running ahead of Mr Jay and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official spokesman, which we know about. Paragraph 18: "In addition to quoting from Portuguese newspapers and the Drs McCanns' official spokesman I approached my own sources."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just repeating A. That was the story that we were writing in the early stages. The story about the confusion, about the lack of information. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm running ahead of Mr Jay and I shouldn't. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official spokesman, which we know about. Paragraph 18: "In addition to quoting from Portuguese newspapers and the Drs McCanns' official spokesman I approached my own sources." Could you make it clear for us, please, it's dealt with in paragraph 19, who your own sources were?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just repeating A. That was the story that we were writing in the early stages. The story about the confusion, about the lack of information. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm running ahead of Mr Jay and I shouldn't. MR JAY: Paragraph 13, please, Mr Pilditch. You make it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official spokesman, which we know about. Paragraph 18: "In addition to quoting from Portuguese newspapers and the Drs McCanns' official spokesman I approached my own sources." Could you make it clear for us, please, it's dealt with in paragraph 19, who your own sources were? A. What I'm saying is that we were looking at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Because of these lack of appeals, there was just no the things that should have been done, the strategies that should have been put in place by the police were not there, so at the time when it was most important that people were alerted to what was going on, that didn't happen. And throughout the whole investigation, I think this lack of information meant that and there were leaks of information as well, which meant that, as I say, there was no strategy. It was just confusion all round, where there should have been focus. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But isn't that then the story? A. Well, the story is to find out what's happened to Madeleine McCann. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, isn't the story the lack of focus and the accusation? And obviously to find Madeleine, but isn't that the position rather than just repeating A. That was the story that we were writing in the early stages. The story about the confusion, about the lack of information. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm running ahead of Mr Jay and I shouldn't. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 making? A. That's exactly what I'm saying. I mean, in the early stages, when we arrived on the story, did what we do on all stories, which is go around speaking to people in the vicinity and trying to find out what they knew. Q. So during this phase, is this right, you were under the impression that the police focus was on an abductor? A. Well, it certainly was, and I mean, there were various lines of enquiry that emerged, but certainly in the very early days they were putting out various descriptions and there were also potential sightings that were reported as well, but this information wasn't coming from the police directly. Q. You say in paragraph 18, when you're dealing with other sources of information, you'd previously identified Mr Clarence Mitchell as being the McCanns' official spokesman, which we know about. Paragraph 18: "In addition to quoting from Portuguese newspapers and the Drs McCanns' official spokesman I approached my own sources." Could you make it clear for us, please, it's dealt with in paragraph 19, who your own sources were?

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

		-	
1	of starting point, very often, of what sort of lines you	1	within the police investigation at that time."
2	might be pursuing on a particular day. But then, as it	2	Is that right?
3	became apparent that the police weren't going to	3	A. Yes.
4	co-operate directly, I had to try and make contact with	4	Q. But in truth, is this not also right, that the best you
5	them in whichever way I could, and the way I did that	5	could do was to obtain from your Portuguese journalists
6	was by identifying journalists who had from the area	6	their report of what senior officers were apparently
7	and crime reporters who'd got very good police contacts	7	telling those Portuguese journalists?
8	and they were in daily contact with them, with the most	8	A. Sorry?
9	senior officers in the case, as I've said, who were	9	Q. The best you could do was to obtain from the two
10	investigating the crime.	10	Portuguese journalists who were your main source their
10		10	report of what they were apparently being told by senior
	Q. You identify three sources, don't you, who provided you with information, you gay. Two wars Portuguese	11	officers within the Portuguese police service?
12	with information, you say. Two were Portuguese		A. Yes.
13	journalists who, you say, were in daily contact with the	13	
14	most senior officers investigating Madeleine's	14	Q. You say in paragraph 21, five lines down maybe
15	disappearance. The third was a translator who worked	15	I should read the preceding sentence:
16	for the Portuguese police and translated, interpreted in	16	"Indeed, by this point in time, one of my
17	the Portuguese legal system.	17	contacts"
18	A. Yes.	18	Is this one of the three you had identified
19	Q. Is that right?	19	previously?
20	A. Yes.	20	A. Yes.
21	Q. So they were, as it were, your sources? You haven't	21	Q. " was informing me of day-to-day developments as they
22	given their names, but in terms of who they were	22	were taking place and before they were being written
23	A. Yeah.	23	about in Portuguese newspapers. This enabled me to
24	Q these are the individuals we're talking about?	24	verify the accuracy of the information I was being
25	A. These were my best sources. I mean, during the course	25	given."
	Page 57		Page 59
1	of the time I was there, there were other people, but	1	Would it be fair to say that enabled you to verify
2	these were the ones that I used on a regular basis.	2	some the accuracy of what you were being given?
3	Q. So is this right: the senior officers in the Portuguese	3	A. Yes. It satisfied myself that this wasn't just
4	police who, under Portuguese law, were not supposed to	4	information that was being given to me that wasn't very
5	brief Portuguese journalists, were doing just that,	5	good information; it confirmed that my source was
6	unofficially, and then you were, as it were, picking up	6	dealing, as he said, with the most senior officers in
7	on the scraps of their briefings from your contact with	7	the case.
8	those journalists? Is that right?	8	Q. Can I ask you about paragraph 22:
9	A. Yes. And if there was I was able to sort of develop	9	"Although I was confident of the veracity of the
10	a dialogue with the police through these third-party	10	reports I was writing, due to the secrecy of justice
10	sources, so sometimes in the Portuguese newspapers they	11	laws they were impossible to prove, to any satisfactory
11	didn't there was only just one or two lines that	11	legal standard, at that time. The fact is that every
12	weren't developed that may need more developing, so	12	newspaper, TV network or media organisation that
15 14		13 14	reported on details of the investigation into
	I was able to ask questions to the police, not directly, but through the journalists who were talking to them		· ·
15	but through the journalists who were talking to them	15	Madeleine McCann's disappearance were in the same boat."
16	every day.	16	A. Mm.
17	Q. So you put a question to the journalists, the	17	Q. You're effectively saying there that given all the
18	journalists to the police, and the answer came back; is	18	problems you've identified, in particular the
		19	restrictions imposed by Portuguese law, on one level, at
19	that what you're saying, Mr Pilditch?		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
19 20	A. Well, the answer didn't always come back, but yeah, that		least, what you were writing about was impossible to
19 20 21	A. Well, the answer didn't always come back, but yeah, that was the process that I was working through.	21	prove to any satisfactory legal standard. Is that what
19 20 21 22	A. Well, the answer didn't always come back, but yeah, that was the process that I was working through.Q. You say in paragraph 21:	21 22	prove to any satisfactory legal standard. Is that what you're saying?
19 20 21 22 23	A. Well, the answer didn't always come back, but yeah, that was the process that I was working through.Q. You say in paragraph 21: "Despite the barriers thrown up by the Portuguese	21 22 23	prove to any satisfactory legal standard. Is that what you're saying?A. Yeah. I mean, I knew that the reports were correct, but
19 20 21 22	A. Well, the answer didn't always come back, but yeah, that was the process that I was working through.Q. You say in paragraph 21:	21 22 23 24	prove to any satisfactory legal standard. Is that what you're saying?A. Yeah. I mean, I knew that the reports were correct, but I also knew because they there was no confirmation,
19 20 21 22 23	A. Well, the answer didn't always come back, but yeah, that was the process that I was working through.Q. You say in paragraph 21: "Despite the barriers thrown up by the Portuguese	21 22 23	prove to any satisfactory legal standard. Is that what you're saying?A. Yeah. I mean, I knew that the reports were correct, but

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

1	complaints were made because they just weren't from	1	desk?
2	a publicly declared statement.	2	A. Yes. I said "If we're going to have any problems, we
3	Q. I appreciate your role as journalist is not to obtain	3	may not be able to defend these things because we just
4	legal advice, not to edit the story, but these	4	cannot get any confirmation", and that was the
5	difficulties which you are frankly referring to here,	5	difficulty.
6	did they cause you to hesitate at all in writing the	6	Q. And what was the reaction from your news desk, if any?
7	stories you did?	7	A. Well, they took my comments on board and as I said,
8	A. Yeah. You feel uncomfortable writing stories where	8	you're in a situation where it's a story of great
9	you're being put in a position where you can't do it in	9	interest and you've got newspapers and TV from all
10	the way that you're used to, to be certain that what	10	around the world who are covering it and you know that
11	you're saying is fair and accurate, and the only way	11	your rivals are working on similar information and
12	I felt that I could get round that would be to just	12	they've got similar issues, and it's the sort of process
13	explain the information in terms of this is where the	13	that, you know, reporters go through every day when
14	information's being sourced from. So if it was this	14	they're explaining what information they've got, and,
15	information's coming from the Portuguese police, I don't	15	you know, I knew that all I could do was present it in
16	know if it's 100 per cent correct, but I know that it's	16	the with sort of explaining the sources that the
17	coming from the Portuguese police.	17	where the information had come from.
18	Q. Your discomfiture, was that something you discussed with		Q. You told us about three or four minutes ago you couldn't
19	your news desk?	19	not write the story.
20	A. Yeah, I mean we had dialogues all the time, every day,	20	A. Yes.
21	and I explained to them the problems that we were having	21	Q. And then you went back to what the position was at the
22	and, as I say, you couldn't just not write a story,	22 23	early stages with the missing child
23 24	particularly in the early stages of the enquiry, where what you were doing was basically launching appeals and	23	A. Yes.
24 25	trying to get people to come forward.	24	Q and all of that, but the position we're talking about now with the defamatory articles, they were written
23	Page 61	23	Page 63
1	So basically, every day when I'd speak to the news	1	between September 2007 and January 2008.
2	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know,	1 2	A. Mm.
2 3	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as		A. Mm.Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese
2 3 4	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the	2 3 4	A. Mm.Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007?
2 3 4 5	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all	2 3 4	A. Mm.Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007?A. Yes.
2 3 4	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it.	2 3 4	A. Mm.Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007?A. Yes.Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story.
2 3 4 5 6 7	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it.Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in	2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Mm.Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007?A. Yes.Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it.Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it.Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Mm.Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007?A. Yes.Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it.Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been discussions, ongoing discussions, and that was the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law? A. Yes, a lot of work, yeah. We spoke to lawyers in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been discussions, ongoing discussions, and that was the situation that we were in and there was no way around 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law? A. Yes, a lot of work, yeah. We spoke to lawyers in Portugal, and it was explained to me that there were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been discussions, ongoing discussions, and that was the situation that we were in and there was no way around it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law? A. Yes, a lot of work, yeah. We spoke to lawyers in Portugal, and it was explained to me that there were subtle differences between arguidos and suspects.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been discussions, ongoing discussions, and that was the situation that we were in and there was no way around it. Q. I must persist with the question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law? A. Yes, a lot of work, yeah. We spoke to lawyers in Portugal, and it was explained to me that there were subtle differences between arguidos and suspects. There's no legal equivalent.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been discussions, ongoing discussions, and that was the situation that we were in and there was no way around it. Q. I must persist with the question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law? A. Yes, a lot of work, yeah. We spoke to lawyers in Portugal, and it was explained to me that there were subtle differences between arguidos and suspects. There's no legal equivalent. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: They're merely entitled to have legal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 desk, normally you'd say, "Look, this is what we know, this is what the police are saying, and that's taken as being fact", but the conversations I was having with the news desk were explaining the information I had with all the caveats that were attached to it. Q. Did you tell your news desk that which we see in paragraph 23 of your statement, namely: "Due to the restrictions of the Portuguese law, anyone who was unhappy about something that had been written or said about them and wished to take legal action would almost certainly have been successful." Was that sentiment shared with your news desk at the time? A. Well, this is what I felt on the ground. I'm not a legal expert, but I felt that just the situation as it presented itself, that that was the case, and I'm certain that the news desk would have had conversations with lawyers about this, and there would have been discussions, ongoing discussions, and that was the situation that we were in and there was no way around it. Q. I must persist with the question. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Mm. Q. The McCanns were given arguido status under Portuguese law I think on 7 September 2007? A. Yes. Q. It might be said, well, you could not write the story. There was no imperative to write stories which you knew wouldn't stand up to legal scrutiny. Do you see that point? A. Yes. But the position that we were in was that this was probably the most significant development that had happened up to that time in the investigation. Q. Sorry, what was, Mr Pilditch? A. Well, when the McCanns were named arguidos. It's not something you could ignore. It's not something where you could just present a story that was based on a comment from the McCanns' official spokesperson. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you do any work to find out precisely what that meant in Portuguese law? A. Yes, a lot of work, yeah. We spoke to lawyers in Portugal, and it was explained to me that there were subtle differences between arguidos and suspects.

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

1 A. Thinki if you put it into context of the story, the 2 Tensore we wont "meety" from shall just sait. 2 3 A. No we were given a complexely different version by the 3 4 havyes in brougal. Wase and that efficiency and 5 orgatum is to put meet to ugher questions than they 6 6 operatum is to put meet to ugher questions than they 6 7 could to a visues, and they were allowed legal 7 8 representation and 1 think the McCanns themselves were 8 Q. Yeas. But we're moving away from that, aren't we, with 9 gives some evy, very togiq questions from the 10 A. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann. 11 LORD 10TECLEVESON: So proceedings in English crass word 11 and that' what my job was to do. 12 be active? 12 Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories 13 A. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann. 11 14 were areacide anything like duff. 13 15 word macher anything like duff. 14 16 were areacide anything like duff. 15 17 Nee anytawee anytof a bord hink they 15				
3 A. No we were given a completely different version by the 3 Treme there is a sort of a vortex, isn't there, that is created. 4 lawyers in Portugal. We were told that effectively an 4 created. 6 opportunity to put much tougher questions than they 6 mean precisely by that? 7 created and investive and were allowed legal 7 A. The dissoparation coll Mudeline McCann. 8 representation and Think the McCann themselves were 8 Q. Yes. But we're moving away from that, aren't we, with 9 portugine police. 10 A. Well, I way guits rporting on day-to-day developments. 11 IORD JUSTICE LEVENSON: So proceedings in Pagifol terms would 11 and that's what my job was to do. 12 be activ? 13 Collection: 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [thei] 16 hayers in Portugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 15 17 MR IAY: Yes. Th and sure webscher you fully saw the point 17 "Doucced of Thim rather than the Drs McCann directly. 18 A strue, simulation there, that, rathy. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 19 A. Serue, sort of the ckan where sort of things th	1	-	1	A. I think if you put it into context of the story, the
4 Insyres in Portugal. We were rold that effectively an 4 created. 5 arguido is a supect. It gives the police an 5 Q. You keep on using the term "the story". What do you 6 opportunity to put much tougher questions than they 6 Not a mean procisely by that? 7 could to a winess, and they were allowed legal 7 A. The disappearance of Madeleian KCann. 8 representation and think the MCCann themselves were 9 the particular picces you write? 10 Fortugasce police. 10 A. Well, I was just reporting on day-to-day developments 11 LORD INSTRE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms word! 11 A. There are suble differences, but I don't think they 13 arguidy is a graved from that, aren't we, with 12 be active? 14 were arcseld o anything like that. But effectively 14 specemating anything like that. But effectively 14 specemating and that were any any any any any any anything like that. But effectively 13 A Isree assuble differences, but I don't with any any any any any any anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 14 were arcseld o anything like that. But effectively 14 publicat	2	I remove the word "merely" from what I just said.	2	story was such a huge story, and I suppose you're right,
5 arguido is a suspect. It gives the police and 5 Q. You keep on using the term "the story". What do you 6 orportanity to part much trongher questions than they 6 mean precisely by that? 7 arguido is a suspect. It gives the police were allowed legal 7. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann. 8 percentral transmitter of the transmitter of the presentation and think the McCans themselves were 80. Yes. But were moving away from that, aren't we, with 10 HOD JUSTICE LEVESON: So proceedings in Faglish terms would 11 and that's what my job was to do. 11 be activ? 10 A. Well, I was just reporting on day-to-day developments 11 were areas what offerences, but I duri think they 11 and that's what my job was to do. 12 be activ? 10 A. Nore, suspect that its orteries would be 13 were areas what was explained to us by the 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [heir] 13 was areas of anything lite that. But affectively 14 14 Is as question, Any Piddixh. 14 NB LAY: Yes. In not are whether you fully saw the point 16 spokesman. It was agreed that all stories would be 15 A. Not, is see, Well, I - mon, yeah. I doo'I - can't, really. <	3	A. No, we were given a completely different version by the	3	I mean there is a sort of a vortex, isn't there, that is
6 opportunity to put much bugher questions than they 6 mean precisely by fhat? 7 cold to a witness, and they were allowed legal 7 A. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann. 9 given some very, very togh questions from the 9 9 A. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms would 11 and that's what my job was to do. 12 be active? 12 Q. Ves. Luw ere moving away from that, aren't we, with and that's what my job was to do. 13 A. There are suble differences, but I don't think they 13 and that's what my ob was to do. 14 were arcsted or anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: "Once Charence Mitchell was appointed as (their)" 15 that was the- was what was explained to us by the 15 "Once Charence Mitchell was appointed as (their)" 16 a discussion, MP Ridich. 17 bounced of thim rather than the DS MCCann directly. 17 hat yeek and in do't - can', really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 20 That it brings into play entempt of court issues. 20 Were by site of thim shime than deeplaining that -2 23 hore situation there wore of t	4	lawyers in Portugal. We were told that effectively an	4	created.
7 could to a witness, and they were allowed legal 7 A. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann. 8 representation and I think the McCanns themselves were 8 Q. Yes. But we're moving away from thit, aren't we, with 9 given some vey, very tough questions from the 9 Ves. But we're moving away from thit, aren't we, with 10 Potraguese polic. 10 A. Well, I was just reporting on day-tooldy developments 11 LORD UTSCELEVESON: So proceedings in English terms word 11 and that's what ny do was to do. 12 be active? 12 Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories 13 A. There are solde differences, but I don't think they 13 were checked with more than one source prior to 14 were arensel or anything like that. But effectively 14 publicitation: The things ino porugon. 15 that was question. MP Pådich. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 17 16 A. Sues. Well, 1mn, yeah, 1 don't - an't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 21 A. Lew. Well, 1mn, yeah, 1 don't - an't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 23 briefing the press at this time and ex	5	arguido is a suspect. It gives the police an	5	Q. You keep on using the term "the story". What do you
8 representation and 1 laink the McCanas themselves were 9 9 Q. Yes. But we're moving away from that aren't we, with 9 9 given some very, very tough questions from the 9 10 A. Well. I was just reporting on day-to-day developments and that's what my job was to do. 10 A. Well. I was just reporting on day-to-day developments and that's what my job was to do. 10 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms would 11 and that's what my job was to do. 12 be serve? 12 Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories were checked with more than one source prior to publication: 13 A. There are subtle differences, but I don't hink they 14 16 spokestman, it was agreed that all stories would be publication: 14 were arrested or anything like that. But effectively 14 16 spokestman, it was agreed that all stories would be 15 The was that at question. MF Platitch. 19 A. Sory. 19 In relation, though, to the stories? 10 20 0. That the wey stort of things that the 24 vern sort of the extem where sort of things that the 24 24 Was part of a black propagnad campaign and that there 25 26 Portugues police were accusing them of. 21 Nch in the polite were satt	6	opportunity to put much tougher questions than they	6	mean precisely by that?
9 given some very, very tough questions from the 9 the particular pieces you write? 10 Portuguese police. 10 A. Well, It was just reporting on day-to-day developments 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms would 11 and that's what my job was to do. 12 be active? 12 Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories 13 A. There are suble differences, but I don't hink they 13 were areasted or anything like that. But effectively 14 were arreasted or anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 15 that was the – was what was explained to us by the 15 mat was appointed as [their] 16 lawyers in Dortugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 16 averse in stories which we know 10 This was strictly adhered to." 17 O Land it brings into play contempt of coart issues. 20 Were by agreement decemed to be defamatory, did 21 A. Well, 1 – mn, yeah, I don't – can't, really. 21 Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCanns sonespoende were 23 A. Well, he comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCanns sonespoende were 24 A. Well, he comment on all such tories? 23	7	could to a witness, and they were allowed legal	7	A. The disappearance of Madeleine McCann.
10 Poruguese police. 10 A. Well, I was just reporting on day-to-day developments and that's what my job was to do. 11 LORD JUSTRE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms would be serve? 11 2 Q. Away. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories were checked with more than one source prior to publication: 13 A. There are subtle differences, but I don't think they 13 were checked with more than one source prior to publication: 14 were arested or anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 16 havyes in Portugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 16 of that last question, Mr Pildich. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 17 bounced of Thim rather than the Dres McCann directly. 10 Ne kNAY. You say undered to the defamatory, did 18 of that last question, Mr Pildich. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 10 19 A. Sory. 10 The problem is that the McCanas' spokespoole were 21 Mr Michell comment on all such actrops, and very often, you was part of a black propagada campaign and that there. 24 even sort of the extemt where where the McCanns are accorded. 1 Q. Then you make i clear in paragraph 25, and this would have to be the case under Portuguese law: <t< td=""><td>8</td><td>representation and I think the McCanns themselves were</td><td>8</td><td>Q. Yes. But we're moving away from that, aren't we, with</td></t<>	8	representation and I think the McCanns themselves were	8	Q. Yes. But we're moving away from that, aren't we, with
11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms would 11 and that's what my job was to do. 12 be active? 12 Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories 14 were arested or anything like that. But effectively 13 were checked with more than one source prior to 15 that was the - was what was explained to us by the 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [their] 16 hayses of that last question, Mr Piditch. 16 spocksman, it was agreed that all stories would be 17 M. Dars. Piditch. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 18 of that hat question, Mr Piditch. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 14 a visce. Vel. 1 - mm, yeal, holm - carn, really. 11 The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were 22 A. Well, 1 - mm, yeal, holm - carn, really. 23 The problem is that the McCanns spokespeople were 25 A. Well, 1 - mm, yeal, holm - carn, really. 24 was spot of a hack propaganda campaging and that there 24 was part of a hack propaganda campaging and that there 25 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 2 have to be the casu under Portuguese law: <	9	given some very, very tough questions from the	9	the particular pieces you write?
12 be active? 12 Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories 13 A. There are subtle differences, but I don't hink they 13 were checked with more than one source prior to 14 were arested or anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 15 hat was the was what was explained to us by the 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [their] 16 lawyers in Portugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 18 MK JAY: Vs. I'm not sure whether you fully saw the point 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 A. Sory. 19 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did 21 A. I see. Well, I - mm, yesh. J don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you 24 even sot of the extent where sot of dhings that the 24 was part of a black propagnal campaign and that there 25 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 4 2	10	Portuguese police.	10	A. Well, I was just reporting on day-to-day developments
13 A. There are subtle differences, but I don't think they 13 were arested or anything like that. But effectively 14 were arested or anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 15 fragge anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 16 lawyers in Portugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [their] 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 17 NB IAN: Yes. The not sure whether you fully saw the point 17 NF hichell comment on all such stories ? 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 N were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did 21 M. Thichell comment on all such stories ? 20 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you 22 A. Well, he commented on the stories which we know 20 was no evidence to back up what the police were saying. 23 briefing the priss at his time ad explaining that - 23 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 24 even sort of the extent where sort of thi	11	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So proceedings in English terms would	111	and that's what my job was to do.
14 were arrested or anything like that. But effectively 14 publication: 15 that was the was what was explained to us by the 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [their] 16 lawyers in Portugal. 16 "spokesman," twas agreed that all stories would be 17 MR JAY: Yes. I'm not sure whether you fully saw the point 16 spokesman, i'w as agreed that all stories which we know 20 O. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 10 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 21 A. Sory. 10 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 22 The problem is hat the McCann's pokespoel were 22 A. Welh, te commented on every story, and very often, you 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that - 23 Know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 Was no evidence to back up what the police were saying. 25 Portuguese police were actism them oft. 25 Ners. 10 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would 2 if that's the right werb, arguido status under 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police were acting to the truth or	12	be active?	12	Q. Okay. You say under paragraph 25 that all your stories
15 that was the was what was explained to us by the 15 "Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [their] 16 lawyers in Portugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 17 MR JAY: Yes. Th not sure whether you fully saw the point 17 bounced off him rather than the Drs McCann directly. 18 of that last question, Mr Pilditch. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 A. Isee. Well, 1 mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 19 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did 21 A. Isee. Well, 1 mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you 23 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 23 ortuguese police were accusing them of. 25 was part of a black propaganda campaig and that there 24 it that's the right verb, arguido status under 10 Q. Then you make it clean it megraph 25, and this would 3 ortuguese law. 10 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would 4 speaking out. <t< td=""><td>13</td><td>A. There are subtle differences, but I don't think they</td><td>13</td><td>were checked with more than one source prior to</td></t<>	13	A. There are subtle differences, but I don't think they	13	were checked with more than one source prior to
16 lawyers in Portugal. 16 spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be 17 MR JAY: Yes. Th not sure whether you fully saw the point 17 MR JAY: Yes. Th not sure whether you fully saw the point 18 of that is question, Mr Pildich. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 A. Sory. 19 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 Wr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 21 A. Isse. Well, 1 - em, yeah, 1.dort - cait, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCams' spokespeople were 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that the 23 know, in quite stricher therms, just explaining that the: 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 23 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 25 Portuguese police were accusing them of. 21 M. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would 2 if that's the right verh, arguido status under 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police retrieved to 3 Portuguese law. 4	14	were arrested or anything like that. But effectively	14	publication:
17 MR JAY: Yes. I'm not sure whether you fully saw the point 17 bounced off him rather than the Drs McCann directly. 18 of that last question, Mr Pildich. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did 21 A. Isee. Well, I - mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCann's spokespople were 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that - 23 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that the 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 was no evidence to back up what the police were saying. 25 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 4 speaking out. 4 On the record 7 Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or 7 years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't 8 soht first of the story, which is what you were writing 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 10 A. Yes. 11 A. They were refusi	15	that was the was what was explained to us by the	15	"Once Clarence Mitchell was appointed as [their]
18 of that last question, Mr Pilditch. 18 This was strictly adhered to." 19 A. Sory. 19 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 19 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 21 A. I see. Well, I = mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that - 23 kwas part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the spokespeople were 24 New have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, if that's the right verb, arguido status under 1 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would have to be the case under Portuguese law: 3 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from speaking out. 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to jubical secrecy." 6 A. On the record 5 A. Yes. 9 about, you couldrh, because the police were refusing to tell us on the record. At the sy about, you couldrh, because the police we	16	lawyers in Portugal.	16	spokesman, it was agreed that all stories would be
19 A. Sory. 19 In relation, though, to the stories which we know 20 Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did 21 A. I see. Well, I – mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that this 23 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 25 Portuguese police were accusing them of. 25 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 25 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese law: 3 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 4 seak directly to the police because that is also "On every occasion, Portuguese law: 5 A. Yes. 6 A. On the record - 7 Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or 3 prevented under Portuguese law. 10 helery you. Just atafrai? 11 <td>17</td> <td>MR JAY: Yes. I'm not sure whether you fully saw the point</td> <td>17</td> <td>bounced off him rather than the Drs McCann directly.</td>	17	MR JAY: Yes. I'm not sure whether you fully saw the point	17	bounced off him rather than the Drs McCann directly.
20 Q. Thai it brings into play contempt of court issues. 20 were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did 21 A. I see. Well, I - mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you know the the police were saving. Page 65 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 25 Portuguese police were accusing them of. 24 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 26 We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, if that's the right verb, arguido status under 24 was no evidence to back up what the police were saving. Page 67 2 A. Wes. 3 On every occasion, Portuguese law: 3 On every occasion, Portuguese law: 3 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from systex directly to the police because that is also 9 abott, you couldn't, because the optice refused to so therwise of the story, which is what you were writing about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to the record. 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 10 A. The were refusing to tell us on the record. At the same time, they were a this time leaking particularly aggressively. <tr< td=""><td>18</td><td>of that last question, Mr Pilditch.</td><td>18</td><td>This was strictly adhered to."</td></tr<>	18	of that last question, Mr Pilditch.	18	This was strictly adhered to."
21 A. I see. Well, I mm, yeah, I don't - can't, really. 21 Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories? 22 The problem is that the McCam's spokespeople were 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that 23 Know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 23 even so of the extent where sort of things that the 24 A. Well, he commende on every story, and very often, you 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 25 A. Well, he commend on every story, and very often, you 25 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 3 mo evidence to back up what the police were saying. 2 A. S are stating out. 3 Portuguese law. 3 On every occasion, Portuguese law: 3 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 3 Comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to 4 A. S are sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't sequal (incerly to the police because that is also 9 otherwise of the story, which is what you were writing 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 6 A. On the record 7 Q. In other words, in order toget to the truth or 8 same time, the	19	A. Sorry.	19	In relation, though, to the stories which we know
22 The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were 22 A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that + 23 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 25 Portuguese police were accusing them of. 24 was no evidence to back up what the police were saying. Page 67 1 Q. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded. 1 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would 2 have to be the case under Portuguese law: 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese law: 3 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese law: 4 speak direcity to the police because that is also 9 obact, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 6 A. On the record 7 10 A. Yes. 10 help you. Is that fair? 11 11 Q. To is us concerned with what are the imperatives, if 14 A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the	20	Q. That it brings into play contempt of court issues.	20	were by agreement deemed to be defamatory, did
23 briefing the press at this time and explaining that 23 know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this 24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there 25 Portuguese police were accusing them of. 25 was no evidence to back up what the police were saying. 26 Page 65 Page 67 1 Q. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, 1 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would 2 if that's the right verb, arguido status under 9 No every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 3 Portuguese law. 10 O. revery occasion, Portuguese police refused to 4 comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to 5 5 A. Yes. 6 A. On the record. 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 7 Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or 10 A. Yes. 7 A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the 13 write? 1 A. They were at this time leaking particularly 14 A. Sa I'm saying, this was a very big development in the 12 sagressively.	21	A. I see. Well, I mm, yeah, I don't can't, really.	21	Mr Mitchell comment on all such stories?
24 even sort of the extent where sort of things that the 24 was part of a black propagand campaign and that there 25 Page 65 Was part of a black propagand campaign and that there 26 Page 67 1 Q. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, 1 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would 2 if that's the right verb, arguido status under Portuguese law. 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 3 A. Yes. 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 4 speaking out. 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 5 A. Yes. 6 A. On the record 7 6 Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two 9 about, you couldn't, because the police were writing 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 10 help you. Is that fair? 11 Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if any, which drive the stories which we know you come to 13 write? A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the 14 A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you <t< td=""><td>22</td><td>The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were</td><td>22</td><td>A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you</td></t<>	22	The problem is that the McCanns' spokespeople were	22	A. Well, he commented on every story, and very often, you
25 Portuguese police were accusing them of. 25 was no evidence to back up what the police were saying. 26 Page 65 Page 67 1 Q. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, if that's the right verb, arguido status under 1 Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would have to be the case under Portuguese law: 3 Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from speaking out. 3 "On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to 5 5 A. Yes. 6 On the record 7 years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't speak directly to the police because that is also prevented under Portuguese law. 9 about, you couldn't, because the police were erfusing to 10 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 9 about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to 10 11 Q. Tm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if 11 A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the 12 any, which drive the stories which we know you come to 14 Q. Some police within the police were leaking for whatever 15 13 write? 14 A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the story, adult and way going on, and obviously there would 15 16 report	23	briefing the press at this time and explaining that	23	know, in quite strident terms, just explaining that this
Page 65Page 671Q. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, i fhat's the right verb, arguido status under1Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would have to be the case under Portuguese law:3Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 4 speaking out.1Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would have to be the case under Portuguese police refused to 4 comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to 55A. Yes.3"On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 4 comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to 56Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two 7 years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't 8 speak directly to the police because that is also 9 prevented under Portuguese law.69prevented under Portuguese law.9about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to 1010A. Yes.10help you. Is that fair?11Q. Fm yust concerned with what are the imperatives, if 13aggressively.12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to 13same time, they were at this time leaking particularly 1313sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you 1816A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 2020Us tok at some of the individual pieces, please.20Now, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.10Let were a this tin page 31647. It is right18 <td>24</td> <td>even sort of the extent where sort of things that the</td> <td>24</td> <td>was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there</td>	24	even sort of the extent where sort of things that the	24	was part of a black propaganda campaign and that there
1Q. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded, if that's the right verb, arguido status under1Q. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would2if that's the right verb, arguido status under2have to be the case under Portuguese law:3Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from speaking out.3"On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to5A. Yes.6Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't s speak directly to the police because that is also6A. On the record Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or10A. Yes.9about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to help you. Is that fair?1011Q. Trn just concerned with what are the imperatives, if any, which drive the stories which we know you come to story, and there were newspapers and TV networks11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the same time, they were at this time leaking particularly aggressively.12sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be 	25	Portuguese police were accusing them of.	25	was no evidence to back up what the police were saying.
2if that's the right verb, arguido status under3Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from4speaking out.5A. Yes.6Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two7years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't8speak directly to the police because that is also9prevented under Portuguese law.10A. Yes.11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to13write?14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the15story, and there were newspapers and TV networks16hediscussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all18sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be20something that the lawyers would be discussing.21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or24not? I suspect you'll say it isn', but could you help25us with that?		Page 65		Page 67
2if that's the right verb, arguido status under2have to be the case under Portuguese law:3Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from3"On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to4speaking out.4comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to5A. Yes.5judicial secrecy."6Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two6A. On the record7years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't8otherwise of the story, which is what you were writing8speak directly to the police because that is also9about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to10A. Yes.10help you. Is that fair?11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the12same time, they were at this time leaking particularlyaggressively.13aggressively.14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the15story, and there were newspapers and TV networks1516reporting what was going on, and obviously there would1617be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all1718sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you1819know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be1920ovan and almost defines itself, and then, like a large2023snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or2324not' I suspect you'll say	1	O. We have a situation here where the McCanns are accorded.	1	O. Then you make it clear in paragraph 25, and this would
3Portuguese law. They are prevented, in any event, from 4 speaking out.3"On every occasion, Portuguese police refused to 4 comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to 5 A. Yes.6Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't 8 speak directly to the police because that is also prevented under Portuguese law.6A. On the record 77Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or 8 otherwise of the story, which is what you were writing about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to 10 A. Yes.11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if any, which drive the stories which we know you come to story, and there were newspapers and TV networks11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the 12 same time, they were at this time leaking particularly aggressively.13write?11A. They were refusing to tell us on the newspaper reason; is that not right?14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever reason; is that not right?15story, and there were newspaper from lawyers and all to be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you something that the lawyers would be discussing.12Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 2013writh?14Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 2115snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or 2316P. You make it stelf, and then, like a large 2317Q. You make it stelf, and then, like a large <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>				
4speaking out.4comment on grounds that the enquiry was subject to5A. Yes.5judicial secrecy."6Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two7years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't7years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't6A. On the record7years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't7Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or8speak directly to the police because that is also9about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to10A. Yes.10help you. Is that fair?11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to12same time, they were at this time leaking particularly13aggressively.14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the1415story, and there were newspapers and TV networks15reason; is that not right?16net of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20Something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its20I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory21not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you he				-
 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two 7 years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't 8 speak directly to the police because that is also 9 prevented under Portuguese law. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if 12 any, which drive the stories which we know you come to 13 write? 14 A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the 15 story, and there were newspapers and TV networks 16 reporting what was going on, and obviously there would 17 be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all 18 sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you 19 know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be iscussing. 10 Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 20 something that the lawyers would be discussing. 10 Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 21 Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 22 own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large 23 snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or 24 not? 25 us with that? 25 us with that? 25 I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter, 				
6Q. To say that, this is right, they face a maximum two years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't speak directly to the police because that is also prevented under Portuguese law.6A. On the record 	5			
7years sentence of imprisonment if they do. You can't 87Q. In other words, in order to get to the truth or8speak directly to the police because that is also 99about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to10A. Yes.10help you. Is that fair?11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if 12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to1013write?11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the 1213write?1314A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the 151415story, and there were newspapers and TV networks1616reporting what was going on, and obviously there would1617be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all something that the lawyers would be discussing.1719know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.2012Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 202121Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its 212123snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or 232324not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help2425us with that?25	6		6	
8speak directly to the police because that is also prevented under Portuguese law.8otherwise of the story, which is what you were writing about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to help you. Is that fair?11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if any, which drive the stories which we know you come to write?10A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the same time, they were at this time leaking particularly aggressively.14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the story, and there were newspapers and TV networks14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever reason; is that not right?16reporting what was going on, and obviously there would be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you you make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its com and almost defines itself, and then, like a large own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help10A. Yes.12su with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,	7		7	
9prevented under Portuguese law.9about, you couldn't, because the police were refusing to10A. Yes.10help you. Is that fair?11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if10help you. Is that fair?12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to12same time, they were at this time leaking particularly13write?11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever15story, and there were newspapers and TV networks16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all17Q. Doing it off the record; is that right?18sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right21own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matt			8	-
10A. Yes.10help you. Is that fair?11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to12same time, they were at this time leaking particularly13write?11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the12same time, they were at this time leaking particularly13aggressively.14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever15reporting what was going on, and obviously there would16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all17Q. Doing it off the record; is that right?18sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned				
11Q. I'm just concerned with what are the imperatives, if11A. They were refusing to tell us on the record. At the12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to12same time, they were at this time leaking particularly13write?13aggressively.14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever15story, and there were newspapers and TV networks16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all17Q. Doing it off the record; is that right?18sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,		· ·		
12any, which drive the stories which we know you come to write?12same time, they were at this time leaking particularly aggressively.13write?13aggressively.14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the story, and there were newspapers and TV networks14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever reason; is that not right?16reporting what was going on, and obviously there would be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.18A. Yes.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its sonowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or rot? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so 2525us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,				
13write?13aggressively.14A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the story, and there were newspapers and TV networks14Q. Some people within the police were leaking for whatever reason; is that not right?16reporting what was going on, and obviously there would be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its sonowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or rot? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help u with that?23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,				
 A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the story, and there were newspapers and TV networks reporting what was going on, and obviously there would be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing. Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help us with that? A. As I'm saying, this was a very big development in the story, and there were newspapers and TV networks Some people within the police were leaking for whatever reason; is that not right? A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case. Q. Doing it off the record; is that right? A. Yes. U. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please. These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to, I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter, 				
15story, and there were newspapers and TV networks15reason; is that not right?16reporting what was going on, and obviously there would16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.17be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all17Q. Doing it off the record; is that right?18sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,				
16reporting what was going on, and obviously there would be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case. I720Sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case. I720Sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case. I721Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help us with that?16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case. I725Us with that?16A. Well, it was the senior detectives working on the case.				
 be discussions on the newspaper from lawyers and all sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing. Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help us with that? Doing it off the record; is that right? Q. Doing it off the record; is that right? A. Yes. Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please. These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm 21 going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right 22 to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to, 23 I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory 24 pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so 25 I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter, 				
18sort of parties that would be involved, and I think, you18A. Yes.19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,				-
19know, the actual legal sort of aspects would be something that the lawyers would be discussing.19Q. Just look at some of the individual pieces, please.20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,		· · ·		
20something that the lawyers would be discussing.20These are under tab 4. It's part of exhibit JM2. I'm21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,		-		
21Q. You make it sound as if the story acquires a life of its21going to look first of all at page 31647. It is right22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,				
22own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large22to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,				-
23snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help us with that?23I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,		z = z = mane to sound as it are story acquires a me of its	1	
24not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help24pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so25us with that?25I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,	21		22	to say that all the pieces I'm going to refer to,
25 us with that? 25 I'm not, as it were, concerned to reopen that matter,	21 22	own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large		
Page 66 Page 68	21 22 23	own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or	23	I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory
	21 22 23 24	own and almost defines itself, and then, like a large snowball, runs down a snowy incline. Is that fair or not? I suspect you'll say it isn't, but could you help	23 24	I believe all of them, are agreed to be defamatory pieces and very substantial compensation was paid, so

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1	which won't and can't be reopened.	1	between the British ambassador and senior police
2	A. Mm. Sorry, I don't know where I'm looking.	2	officers at police headquarters in Faro, and I went
3	Q. I'm immediately looking at the wrong page.	3	straight from the airport to the police headquarters and
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, because this is not an article		basically I provided a bit of colour from police
5	written by this witness.	5	headquarters. I wrote about sort of official cars
6	MR JAY: My note is suspect.	6	coming out of these sort of colonial style police
7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What's the date of the article,	7	buildings and things. That was my role in the story.
8	Mr Jay? Do you know?	8	Because nobody wanted to talk to me, so I was just sort
9	MR JAY: 29 November. No, my notes are just wrong. I think	9	of stood outside the police headquarters.
10	we're going to do better with 31645 on 1 December 2007.	10	Q. Fair enough, but the general tenor of this is that the
11	A. Yes, okay.	11	line of investigation within the Portuguese police was
12	Q. This is one we see you co-author.	12	seeking to establish the truth of a hypothesis that
13	A. Mm.	13	Madeleine died as a result of an accident in the flat
14	Q. Can I be clear first of all about one matter. It says	14	and the parents then hid and disposed of the body; is
15	at the start:	15	that right?
16	"Gerry and Kate 'still the prime suspects'."	16	A. What, this particular story?
17	That's the headline. Were you responsible for that	17	Q. Mm.
18	headline?	18	A. I can't comment on this particular story.
19	A. No.	19	Q. Let's look at another one that you might be able to.
20	Q. You say that with confidence. I'm sure in line with	20	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But your name is at the top of it.
21	usual practice, it won't be in dispute that the editor	21	Should that be just ignored?
22	or subeditor is responsible for that. Do I have that	22	A. No, I explained why my name is on the top of it, because
23	right?	23	I played a role in the story, but that's all I did,
24	A. Well, it's not the subeditor, it would be the editor or	24	stand outside police headquarters.
25	the night editor. I'm not too sure who writes	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You didn't read the story before it
	Page 69		Page 71
1	headlines, but it's not the subeditors. They just fit	1	went out under your name?
2	stories into space.	2	A. No. I would have filed my bit of copy to either the
		2	A. No. I would have filed my bit of copy to entite the
3		2	
	Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to		news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story,
3		3	news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story.
3 4	Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay?A. No.	3 4	news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their
3 4 5	Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay?A. No.Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never	3 4 5	news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main
3 4 5 6 7	Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay?A. No.Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor?	3 4 5 6 7	news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often
3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something 	3 4 5 6	news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have 	3 4 5 6 7 8	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. Q. You don't think it is? 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed back to London; is that right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. Q. You don't think it is? A. You see, I didn't really write this story. This has 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed back to London; is that right?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. Q. You don't think it is? A. You see, I didn't really write this story. This has Nick Fagge's name on it. Normally, if you've got 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed back to London; is that right? A. Yes. I can't remember whether I emailed my part of it to London or if I emailed it to Nick Fagge, but it would
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. Q. You don't think it is? A. You see, I didn't really write this story. This has Nick Fagge's name on it. Normally, if you've got somebody who is named first, they are the people who do 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed back to London; is that right? A. Yes. I can't remember whether I emailed my part of it to London or if I emailed it to Nick Fagge, but it would be one of the other, I think.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. I think it's important for our purposes today to establish it's not you, okay? A. No. Q. Is that always the case with these headlines; it's never the journalist, it's always the editor? A. Well, it's never the journalist. You know, something that I think the editor or night editor I mean, I'm not too sure, to be honest. The editor would have a final say about it, but Q. But we can see from the first line of the text: "Kate and Gerry McCann are still regarded as the prime suspects in the disappearance of their daughter despite inconclusive findings from DNA evidence." A. Yes. Q. So that's your wording, isn't it? A. No. Q. You don't think it is? A. You see, I didn't really write this story. This has Nick Fagge's name on it. Normally, if you've got somebody who is named first, they are the people who do most of the writing. I do remember this one because I'd 	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 news desk or to Nick Fagge, who was compiling the story, and it would have just been inserted into the story. Very often reporters write stories and don't get their bylines in the papers because somebody else is the main reporter who is pulling it all together. Very often there could have been more reporters or could have been more input into this story, but I don't think there was. I think Nick Fagge wrote the story and I, as I say, arrived at the airport and went straight to the police headquarters in my hire car, so that's all I did, and then informed him of what had happened at the police headquarters, which was just I was witnessing what took place at this meeting. MR JAY: In terms of the procedure, though, Mr Pilditch, the assumption I was making, but it may be incorrect in the light of what you're saying, is that this is emailed back to London; is that right? A. Yes. I can't remember whether I emailed my part of it to London or if I emailed it to Nick Fagge, but it would be one of the other, I think. Q. Isn't it standard practice that if, on the face of it,

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

1	comment, you approve it or not, and then, you having	1	much, is at the very end:
2	made any contribution you see fit, the text is emailed	2	"The source added: 'Once interviews have been
3	to London?	3	conducted the filed will be passed'."
4	A. No.	4	So whoever the source was, was close to the police
5	Q. Probably here by Mr Fagge. Is that not what happens?	5	investigation, as it were, and we know from the evidence
6	A. No. I wouldn't have seen the whole article. As I say,	6	you're giving us it's likely to be one of the two
7	I would have simply passed on the part of the story	7	journalists, isn't it?
8	I was doing to the news desk or you know, I think	8	A. Yeah.
9	that's what would have happened or the reporter who	9	Q. In terms of the colour, though, which you refer to in
10	was compiling the story.	10	the context of the previous piece, which you say you
11	Q. Okay. So which part of this piece do you say you did	11	didn't have a hand in, the term "fingers of suspicion",
12	write?	12	whose was that?
		12	A. I don't know. I can't say at this
13	A. To be honest, I'm not even sure if anything went in,	13	Q. Might it have been your term, Mr Pilditch?
14	because, as I say, I went to the police headquarters		
15	where this meeting was taking place. $V = 2$	15	A. No. I mean, it's not I don't really know what it
16	Q. Yes?	16	means, to be honest.
17	A. And I would have written some colour about, you know,		Q. Well, because some of the language here might, by some,
18	what I saw. I saw the police officers and I saw the	18	be said to be somewhat loaded.
19	people that I recognised, who I knew who they were, but	19	A. Mm.
20	there was a whole load of, as I say, official cars.	20	Q. For example:
21	Basically, I was stood outside the police station and	21	"Portuguese detectives could fly to Britain to sit
22	when the meeting was over, I saw the people who were	22	in on make-or-break interviews"
23	involved, or some of them, leaving the police	23	You're making it sound as if guilt or innocence
24	headquarters and I'd have just filed some colour about	24	might turn on the result. It is quite heightened, isn't
25	what I saw at the scene. That was my involvement in the	25	it?
	Page 73		Page 75
1	story.	1	A. Well, I mean, we certainly knew that this was something
2	Q. I think it looks as if, from what you're saying, that in	2	that Portuguese police were considering at that time.
3	truth Mr Fagge was the sole author, your name shouldn't		
	that will have been added by your nume should the	3	Q. Okay. And then what about the sentence about eight
4	have been on this at all.	3 4	Q. Okay. And then what about the sentence about eight lines down:
4	have been on this at all. A. No, because	4	lines down:
4 5	have been on this at all.A. No, becauseQ. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you	4 5	lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have
4 5 6 7	have been on this at all.A. No, becauseQ. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted.	4 5 6	lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm.
4 5 6 7 8	have been on this at all.A. No, becauseQ. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted.A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story.	4 5 6 7	lines down:"Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"?A. Mm.Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it?
4 5 6 7 8 9	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing 	4 5 6 7 8	lines down:"Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"?A. Mm.Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it?A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	lines down:"Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"?A. Mm.Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it?A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	lines down:"Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"?A. Mm.Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it?A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives?LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? 	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles where
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese police speaking to a journalist, who then speaks to you; 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles wher they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not bother?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese police speaking to a journalist, who then speaks to you; is that correct? 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not bother? A. What I'm saying is I wrote this story four years ago,
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese police speaking to a journalist, who then speaks to you; is that correct? A. It looks like it. I mean, it doesn't source any 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not bother? A. What I'm saying is I wrote this story four years ago, and I can't remember if those were my specific words or
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese police speaking to a journalist, who then speaks to you; is that correct? A. It looks like it. I mean, it doesn't source any doesn't say that there was any other I mean, 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not bother? A. What I'm saying is I wrote this story four years ago, and I can't remember if those were my specific words or not.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese police speaking to a journalist, who then speaks to you; is that correct? A. It looks like it. I mean, it doesn't source any doesn't say that there was any other I mean, I haven't attributed any other source to it, so 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not bother? A. What I'm saying is I wrote this story four years ago, and I can't remember if those were my specific words or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And "10 issues that have haunted
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 have been on this at all. A. No, because Q. We're not sure where we're seeing the colour you imparted. A. It looks like someone's knocked it out of the story. Doesn't look like it's made the cut. The only thing that made the cut was my name. Q. But we do see from the penultimate sentence: "The McCanns were named as suspects on September 7." A. Yes. Q. Are you sure that's right? A. Well, I didn't write this story. That's what I'm saying. Q. Let's look at one which we can be sure that you did write. 31643, dated 3 December. Just cast an eye over it. Your source here is someone within the Portuguese police speaking to a journalist, who then speaks to you; is that correct? A. It looks like it. I mean, it doesn't source any doesn't say that there was any other I mean, 	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 lines down: "Detectives want to focus on the 10 issues that have haunted them"? A. Mm. Q. That must be your terminology, mustn't it? A. Well, they were obviously struggling, weren't they, the detectives? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry, Mr Pilditch, I'd just like to understand this. In the first sentence it says "10 'fingers of suspicion'". Are you saying you didn't write that? A. I can't recall whether that was my specific wording or not. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, do you read the articles when they come out in the paper and think about whether they've been changed back in London? Or do you not bother? A. What I'm saying is I wrote this story four years ago, and I can't remember if those were my specific words or not.

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

r			
1	A. I'm saying the same thing. I mean, I can't remember if	1	Q. Well, what did you know at the time about the DNA
2	I used that word. The thing is that I file my story and	2	evidence?
3	there are other processes involved after that, so if I'd	3	A. Well, that there was DNA evidence that was being
4	written this story last week, then I'd know exactly	4	examined.
5	well, even if I wrote it last week, I wouldn't know	5	Q. But you didn't know what the results of the examination
6	exactly my specific words, without referring to the	6	were, did you?
7	original copy that I'd sent.	7	A. No.
8	MR JAY: Did you not assemble forgive me for putting it	8	Q. The McCanns' evidence, at page 35 of the transcript
9	in these terms these ten issues from what you'd		
	-	9	A. Transcript?
10	gleaned from reading Portuguese newspapers and then	10	Q. Sorry, pardon me, Mr Pilditch, it's under tab 5.
11	turned it into a story in your own language?	11	A. Yeah.
12	A. Well, I think it would have been speaking to my source.	12	Q. The question which was put at the bottom of page 34:
13	I wrote a story, I presented a story the way I'd written	13	"The overall flavour or thrust of this article [not
14	it, and I can't tell you for certain whether this is the	14	the article we're looking at now, but it doesn't matter,
15	story that I wrote word for word. I doubt that it was,	15	the point is the same] was that there was DNA evidence
16	because it normally isn't, but I don't know which words	16	which linked your daughter with a hire car. What do you
17	I used and which words were used in part of the	17	say about that?
18	subediting process.	18	"Answer: The first thing to say, it's simply
19	Q. Your source was only telling you that interviews could	19	untrue. Madeleine's DNA was not uncovered from the hire
20	take place. I think my question was in order to work	20	car. That's the first thing."
21	out what the subject matter of the interviews might be,	21	A. We know that now, but I don't think we knew that then.
22	you looked at Portuguese newspapers and assembled what	22	The police were saying that it had been.
23	you thought were the ten key issues which might be put	23	Q. The police were saying that some what might have been
24	to the McCanns. Is that not a fair supposition?	24	human tissue was found in the car.
25	A. Well, this is what my source would have been telling me,	25	A. Yes.
	Page 77		Page 79
1	yeah.	1	O And that they had done come to take in Dertwood on it and
1 1	yean.	1	Q. And that they had done some tests in Portugal on it and
	•	1 2	Q. And that they had done some tests in Portugal on it and the results were inconclusive?
2	Q. Are you sure about that?		the results were inconclusive?
2 3	Q. Are you sure about that?A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be?	2	the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain.
2 3 4	Q. Are you sure about that?A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be?Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The	2 3 4	the results were inconclusive?A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain.Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they?
2 3 4 5	Q. Are you sure about that?A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be?Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that?	2 3 4 5	the results were inconclusive?A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain.Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they?A. Well, they were, yeah.
2 3 4 5 6	Q. Are you sure about that?A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be?Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that?A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6	the results were inconclusive?A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain.Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they?A. Well, they were, yeah.Q. I'm just troubled by
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was 	2 3 4 5 6 7	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? A. Well, I think at this time it wasn't known how far it had gone. Q. That's precisely the point. You're making it sound as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? A. Well, I think at this time it wasn't known how far it had gone. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word "finding" is being used. The first is, "We've found
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? A. Well, I think at this time it wasn't known how far it had gone. Q. That's precisely the point. You're making it sound as 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word "finding" is being used. The first is, "We've found something which we believe to be human tissue", and the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? A. Well, I think at this time it wasn't known how far it had gone. Q. That's precisely the point. You're making it sound as if there were findings, when in fact the DNA evidence, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word "finding" is being used. The first is, "We've found something which we believe to be human tissue", and the second is, "We've analysed the human tissue and our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? A. Well, I think at this time it wasn't known how far it had gone. Q. That's precisely the point. You're making it sound as if there were findings, when in fact the DNA evidence, if you're going to properly characterise it, was at best 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word "finding" is being used. The first is, "We've found something which we believe to be human tissue", and the second is, "We've analysed the human tissue and our finding is X", the finding may be it is the DNA of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Are you sure about that? A. Well, I mean why wouldn't it be? Q. Can I just pick up on one of the ten points. The forensic findings, do you see that? A. Yeah. Q. " though not conclusive that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre" A. Yes. Q. You're suggesting there, aren't you, that there were findings presumably this is a reference to DNA evidence which established, although did not do so conclusively, that Madeleine's body was in the spare tyre well in the boot; is that right? A. Yeah. Q. The DNA evidence did not go anything like that far, did it? A. Well, I think at this time it wasn't known how far it had gone. Q. That's precisely the point. You're making it sound as if there were findings, when in fact the DNA evidence, if you're going to properly characterise it, was at best inconclusive. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the results were inconclusive? A. Well, I think the tests were carried out in Britain. Q. And they were also inconclusive, weren't they? A. Well, they were, yeah. Q. I'm just troubled by A. I'm just explaining what the police Q. I'm just troubled by the use of the term "findings" in relation to this eighth or ninth finger of suspicion. I must suggest to you it is wrong and unfair to have characterised them as findings at all. A. Well a finding Q. Whether or not one adds in parentheses that they are not conclusive. A. A finding is something that you found, isn't it? I don't know. But they found something and it was something that was being analysed. Q. There are two different senses in which the word "finding" is being used. The first is, "We've found something which we believe to be human tissue", and the second is, "We've analysed the human tissue and our finding is X", the finding may be it is the DNA of a particular individual.

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

Г

Т

1	you see that?	1	piece.
2	A. Well, I was explaining what the findings were.	2	A. Mm.
3	I mean mm.	3	Q. The thrust of this piece is that Portuguese detectives
4	Q. I think I've taken that point as far as I reasonably can	4	were apparently fearful of the fact that British police
5	with you.	5	would not properly interrogate the McCanns; is that
6	I'm not going to look at all of these, but you did	6	right?
7	write quite a few of these articles. There's another	7	A. Yes.
8	one at 31640.	8	Q. Did you think at the time there was any basis for that
9	A. Mm. This is is this before or after that one? Yeah.	9	fear?
10	Q. Although it's earlier in the bundle, we are working	10	A. Yeah, I did, yeah.
11	A. Backwards.	11	Q. From your own knowledge of British police and Portuguese
12	Q chronologically forwards, I hope, because the	12	police? Did you really think that?
13	previous one was dated 3 December.	13	A. Yes.
14	A. No, you're right, yeah.	14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What did you think, that the British
15	Q. Here you are reporting what the police theory was at	15	police would go easy on suspects?
16	that point, at least the theory which was being	16	A. No, that the Portuguese police believed that. There
17	apparently put out by some in the police to Portuguese	17	seemed to be lots of I don't know if it was cultural
18	journalists.	18	differences, but there seemed to be lots of
19	A. Mm.	19	disagreements going on behind the scenes between various
20	Q. Namely, Madeleine died in an accident and then the	20	authorities, and the officers who were investigating
21	parents covered up the crime and later disposed of their	21	this case, the senior officers, this is what they were
22	daughter's body. You do rightly say in this piece,	22	saying. They believed that I think they were
23	about eight lines down:	23	concerned they'd complain that they'd ask for
24	"Months of painstaking analysis on DNA uncovered in		information and were upset because they only got one
25	Portugal had so far failed to produce conclusive	25	piece of paper or something, background information.
	Page 81		Page 83
1	evidence."	1	
1	evidence.	1	I here was obviously issues going on benind the scenes
1 2	That was the position. And then there were going to	$\begin{vmatrix} 1\\2 \end{vmatrix}$	There was obviously issues going on behind the scenes between the Portuguese police and other authorities.
			between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to
2	That was the position. And then there were going to	2	between the Portuguese police and other authorities.
2 3	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that	2 3	between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to
2 3 4	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?	2 3 4	between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch,
2 3 4 5	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were	2 3 4 5	between the Portuguese police and other authorities.MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest.
2 3 4 5	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached	2 3 4 5 6	between the Portuguese police and other authorities.MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one?
2 3 4 5 6 7	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.	2 3 4 5 6 7	between the Portuguese police and other authorities.MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one?A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported?A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported?A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported?A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right?A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point.Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported?A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view you formed from the outset. That's in your witness 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and worshippers in Praia da Luz.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view you formed from the outset. That's in your witness statement. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and worshippers in Praia da Luz. Q. You think it might have been one of those individuals who passed it on to you; is this right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view you formed from the outset. That's in your witness statement. A. Yeah, I'm talking now about the lack of appeals and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and worshippers in Praia da Luz. Q. You think it might have been one of those individuals who passed it on to you; is this right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view you formed from the outset. That's in your witness statement. A. Yeah, I'm talking now about the lack of appeals and the the investigation didn't get off the ground, but 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and worshippers in Praia da Luz. Q. You think it might have been one of those individuals who passed it on to you; is this right? A. Yes. Q. This is, if I may say so, a rather loaded story because the suggestion is, do I have this right, that the priest
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view you formed from the outset. That's in your witness statement. A. Yeah, I'm talking now about the lack of appeals and the the investigation didn't get off the ground, but I don't know what's going on with experts examining forensic evidence and all this sort of thing. That's just a different part of it. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and worshippers in Praia da Luz. Q. You think it might have been one of those individuals who passed it on to you; is this right? A. Yes. Q. This is, if I may say so, a rather loaded story because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 That was the position. And then there were going to be further tests, I believe, in this country; is that right? A. I can't recall the chronology of when the tests were carried out and what point the investigation had reached at this point. Q. Did you make any personal assessment, did you ponder in your own mind about the inherent plausibility or otherwise of the police position as apparently reported? A. Well, I mean, I didn't know what was going on, but my assessment was that, you know, there must be some form of plausibility in what a modern police force is telling you in the 21st century in a European country. You wouldn't think they would just, you know. Q. You were telling us earlier that the Portuguese police investigation was fatally flawed, and that was the view you formed from the outset. That's in your witness statement. A. Yeah, I'm talking now about the lack of appeals and the the investigation didn't get off the ground, but I don't know what's going on with experts examining forensic evidence and all this sort of thing. That's 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 between the Portuguese police and other authorities. MR JAY: Okay. There's only one other piece I'm going to ask you about, it's 31629, please, Mr Pilditch, 12 December 2007. This is the piece about the priest. Do you remember this one? A. Yes. Q. Your source, I think, three-quarters of the way down the page, is a "close friend of the priest"; is that right? A. The priest? Q. Yes. A. Yes. Q. Are you able to give us any further information about that? A. Um well, this was information that was passed on to me by people who were in contact with the priest. I mean, I was speaking all the time to parishioners and worshippers in Praia da Luz. Q. You think it might have been one of those individuals who passed it on to you; is this right? A. Yes. Q. This is, if I may say so, a rather loaded story because the suggestion is, do I have this right, that the priest

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

1	That's what you're getting at, isn't it?	1	wouldn't get anything from the priest, because he was
2	A. Where have is that part of the story?	2	duty-bound not to tell them anything.
3	Q. Yes. Right in the middle of the page:	3	Q. Mm.
4	"Investigators became convinced Kate had confessed	4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you not get the point that Mr Jay
5	to him but the tormented priest insisted he would	5	is making?
6	stand by his vow to take the secrets of the confessional	6	A. Sorry.
7	to the grave."	7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That the inference in the sentence
8	Are you sure about that sentence, Mr Pilditch?	8	goes rather beyond that and suggests that the priest had
9	A. I know that the police interviewed the priest and	9	a secret to take to the grave?
10	nothing came from it, and I think this is what the	10	A. It says "investigators became convinced". I mean,
11	police were saying.	11	that
12	Q. It might be said that you were drawing a bit of an	12	MR JAY: Yes. Absolutely. If you read the whole lot as one
13	inference here, that you knew from what you were told	13	piece, it reinforces precisely that point.
14	that the priest had been interviewed by the police, but	14	A. Mm.
15	it's just the clause "the tormented priest insisted he	15	Q. Because here we have a very well, I've made the point
16	would stand by his vow to take the secrets of the	16	already, Mr Pilditch. I'm not sure that you're fully
17	confessional to the grave", I'm troubled a bit by that,	17	seeing it, though. A. No.
18	whether that's a bit of journalistic licence on your	18	
19	part. Are you sure about the accuracy of that statement?	19 20	Q. Okay.A. What I'm saying is this is what the investigators
20 21	A. I think the accuracy is that priests that's how	20	A. what I m saying is this is what the investigators they interviewed the priest and got nothing from him,
21 22	confessional works, isn't it?	21	and I think they probably thought that they were just
22	Q. As a matter of general proposition it may well be, but	22	going through a routine of interviewing a priest.
23 24	you're going a bit further than that, because you're	23	I think they suspected that they wouldn't get anything
24	suggesting that not merely would the priest stand by his		from him. So I'm just saying what was going on, what
25	Page 85		Page 87
	6		6
1	religious obligation, but he would also be taking the	1	the police were how they were as I say, this is
2	secrets of the confessional to his grave because he was	2	like a bit of thinking out loud by the police that was
3	given a confession by Dr Kate McCann. Isn't that what	3	in the public domain and it's the sort of thing that
4	you're getting at?	4	normally police officers wouldn't sort of tell you,
5	A. I think the Portuguese police were saying that they'd	5	really.
6	interviewed Father Pacheco and they hadn't got anything	6	Q. To be fair to you, Mr Pilditch, can we be clear about
7	of any use. The problem with a lot of this stuff was	7	two or three matters? First of all, you don't, of
8	the way the information was leaking out, it was like	8	course, have a lawyer advising you as to what to put or
9	thinking out loud, really.	9	not to put into your copy?
10	Q. Yes.	10	A. No.
11	A. These were the sort of conversations that in a police	11	Q. We know that, it's not standard practice for that to
12	sort of a, you know, force in this country would be the	12	happen. That happens higher up the chain, doesn't it?
13	sort of things that officers would be talking about	13	A. Yes.
14	behind the scenes. But	14	Q. And secondly, it's ultimately the editor's decision, not
15	Q. But all you knew as a fact, if your source was to be	15	yours, as to whether to publish any particular story
16	trusted, and let's assume for the purposes of this	16	that is put up by you or any other journalist; is that
17	exchange that your source could be, is that the police	17	right?
18	had interviewed the priest.	18	A. Yeah.
19	A. Yes.	19	Q. And in terms of the chains or lines of communication,
20	Q. But everything else was an inference that you might have	20	the standard line of communication is between you and
21	drawn, indeed did draw, in particular the bit about the	21	the news desk, and then the news desk and the editor; is
22	tormented priest insisting he would stand by his vow to	22	that also right?
23	take the secrets of the confessional to the grave. You	23	A. Yeah.
24	weren't told that by anyone, were you?	24	Q. Did you have any conversations with the editor at any
25	A. I think the police were explaining why they thought they Page 86	25	stage about any of these stories? Page 88
1	rage ou		rage oo

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

-		-	
1	A. No.	1	it would be published simply on the human basis that we
2	Q. I think you've told us earlier that any misgivings you	$\begin{vmatrix} 1\\2 \end{vmatrix}$	have already a tragic situation, parents have lost their
3	had about the accuracy of the stories and the	$\begin{vmatrix} 2\\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	daughter in the sense that the daughter has disappeared?
4	difficulties you were having were shared with the news	4	A. Yes.
	desk; is that correct?		
5		5	Q. Absolutely clear. They are in a state of emotional turmoil?
6	A. Yes.	6	
7	Q. Is that something you think might have happened once or		A. Yeah.
8	something that might have happened more than once?	8	Q. And then to add to that natural emotional turmoil, what
9	A. Sorry?	9	is being written about them.
10	Q. Your discussions with the news desk?	10	A. Yeah.
11	A. Yeah.	11	Q. How does this factor into this, if at all, from your
12	Q. In particular about misgivings in relation to the story	12	perspective? Not from your perspective now, but from
13	and the difficulties you were having in verifying	13	your perspective at the time?
14	a story.	14	A. At the time, I really didn't know what was going on.
15	A. I think every day you would have conversations with the	15	I knew that the police investigation was headed down
16	news desk throughout the day and you'd explain the	16	this particular path and, as I say, I'd have no idea why
17	information that you had and where it had come from. As		the police were heading down this path and, well, this
18	I say, you'd explain the caveats that were attached to	18	is the point that we were at and this was I didn't
19	it.	19	know what happened to Madeleine McCann, I still don't
20	Q. My final point is, is this a possible explanation for	20	know, so I'm just saying that at this time, this was
21	what happened here in relation to, to use your term, the	21	what was happening and I was reporting on the
22	story: the McCanns are declared arguidos by the	22	developments that were happening, but I didn't know if
23	Portuguese authorities on 7 September 2007, and the	23	the police were barking up the wrong tree or if, you
24	direction of the story changes?	24	know, as I say, you'd expect them to have some form of
25	A. Yeah.	25	competency.
	Page 89		Page 91
1	Q. And instead of being a standard story about child	1	Q. I'm not sure you have answered my question. Can you
2	abduction, it becomes a rather more sinister story, in	2	remember what it was? I can repeat it again.
3	inverted commas. It's that story or version which	3	A. Yes, if you could repeat it, yeah.
4	starts to dictate the direction in which people like you	4	Q. You already have a huge amount of emotional turmoil:
5	are writing their copy? Is that a fair characterisation	5	a four-year-old child has disappeared. It goes without
6	of what might be happening here?	6	saying.
7	A. Well, at that particular point in time, I was reporting	7	A. Yeah.
8	on the sort of day-to-day developments that were going	8	Q. And then people like you, if you don't mind me putting
9	on on the ground, and this is pretty much what was	9	it in those terms, are writing stories which imply that
10	· · ·	10	the child has not been abducted, something far more
10	happening. During this time, there was also there were contradictory reports. You know, the Portuguese	10	sinister has happened.
11	police at different times were saying contradictory	11	
			A. Right.
13	things. One day they're saying that, you know, they're	13 14	Q. The propensity of those matters being written about
14	going down one route and the next day they're heading		would naturally add to the emotional turmoil which is
15	off in a completely different direction. So not all the	15	already immense. It's whether that enters into your thisking at the time at all when you are writing these
16	reports were of this nature, but at this particular	16	thinking at the time at all when you are writing these
17	point in time when the investigation had reached this	17	stories?
18	point, then this was the sort of information that was	18	A. Well, I think I explained. I mean, there is emotional
19	coming out.	19	turmoil, but I'm reporting on what's happening on the
20	Q. Okay. There is one more question, I hope you don't mind		ground.
21	me putting this. I appreciate that it's the editor's	21	Q. Okay.
22	decision as to whether this material is published.	22	A. On that particular day.
23	A. Yes.	23	MR JAY: I think I understand, Mr Pilditch. Thank you very
24	Q. But did you have any personal concerns about this	24	much.
			
25	material going up to the editor with the likelihood that Page 90	25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I have a slightly different point, Page 92

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

1			
1	which is this: you may not understand the Portuguese	1	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but you didn't know at the time
2	law, and that's entirely fair enough.	2	A. No, but I knew at the time that these were genuine lines
3	A. Yeah.	3	of enquiry and this particular line was the only line
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you do understand, I'm sure you	4	the police were pursuing at that time. I didn't know
5	would agree, that stories have to stand up?	5	the truth.
6	A. Yes.	6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But the evidence you've got, that
7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And that your paper is at risk of	7	you've now seen, doesn't in fact justify some of this
8	massive damages claims if you write something that's	8	stuff, does it? Because the DNA was not in this
9	defamatory?	9	condition that you described it in your article.
10	A. Yes.	10	A. Yeah. The police were claiming it was in a I think
11	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That you can't then stand up?	11	the police were telling lies and trying to claim they
12	A. Yes. Well, I think I've said that in my statement.	12	had more than they actually had. But in 2008 in July
13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. You were getting all	13	when the police released their official file, this was
14	sorts of tittle-tattle	14	some time after this period, there's lots of
15	A. Right.	15	documentation and there's lots of all sorts of
16	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: from different people in	16	statements and the whole file that they'd been
17	circumstances when you knew the police couldn't	17	investigating. It's only when that was published that
18	officially talk, is that fair?	18	you could see that actually this whole thing was based
19	A. Yes.	19	on a false premise. The police went as hard as they did
20	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And as far as you were concerned they	20	down this line and they had no reason to do it, they had
21	were going off in very different directions, one day	21	no evidence to back them up.
22	this, one day something else; that's your assessment of	22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So all the stuff, for example, about
23	what they'd been doing?	23	what the priest might have been told, it's all fluff.
24	A. But at this point in time, they were very much focusing	24	There's nothing to it.
25	on this.	25	A. It's all things that were happening at the time. But if
	Page 93		Page 95
1	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So be it, but you had the experience	1	you look at things now, knowing what we know in the
2	of what they had been doing.	2	public domain, it's a very different picture.
3	A. Mm.	3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I agree, and that's why I asked you
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you ever have any concern that		
5		4	whether you were concerned at the time that you couldn't
	you wouldn't be able to stand up this story?	4 5	whether you were concerned at the time that you couldn't stand the story up with the risk that your paper was
6	you wouldn't be able to stand up this story? A. Yeah.		stand the story up with the risk that your paper was
		5	stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.
	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern	5 6	stand the story up with the risk that your paper wasexposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but
6 7	A. Yeah.	5 6 7	stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of
6 7 8	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written?	5 6 7 8	stand the story up with the risk that your paper wasexposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but
6 7 8 9	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written?A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write	5 6 7 8 9	stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by
6 7 8 9 10	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written?A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were	5 6 7 8 9 10	stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper.
6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written?A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were.A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written?A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Yeah.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written?A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 e16	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 e16 17	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, into a story? 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 e16 17 18	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other way of doing it. All I could do was exactly spell out
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, into a story? A. It's not tittle-tattle, you see. This was 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 e16 17 18 19	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other way of doing it. All I could do was exactly spell out who was saying what. I was saying if it was a police
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, into a story? A. It's not tittle-tattle, you see. This was LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Isn't it? 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other way of doing it. All I could do was exactly spell out who was saying what. I was saying if it was a police source, this is what the police are saying. Or if it
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, into a story? A. It's not tittle-tattle, you see. This was LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Isn't it? A. No, because it was information that was coming from the 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other way of doing it. All I could do was exactly spell out who was saying what. I was saying if it was a police source, this is what the police are saying. Or if it was somebody else, I'd say this is what they were
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, into a story? A. It's not tittle-tattle, you see. This was LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Isn't it? A. No, because it was information that was coming from the senior detectives investigating the case. 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 e16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other way of doing it. All I could do was exactly spell out who was saying what. I was saying if it was a police source, this is what the police are saying. Or if it was somebody else, I'd say this is what they were saying. As a journalist, as a reporter, you want to
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yeah. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And did that give rise to concern that you shouldn't be writing it as it was written? A. I think I was writing it in the only way I could write it, because I was explaining where my sources were coming from and I was explaining that this isn't something that I can prove or confirm. But those sort of decisions would be made further up the chain about the law. But I was just writing on developments that were going on on the ground at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So you saw your role purely to reduce whatever you heard, from whatever source you heard it, into a story? A. It's not tittle-tattle, you see. This was LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Isn't it? A. No, because it was information that was coming from the senior detectives investigating the case. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or so you were told. 	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 c16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 stand the story up with the risk that your paper was exposed to massive damages claims, as indeed they were. A. Well, I was uncomfortable writing stories like this, but I felt it was the only way to write it, but the sort of decisions about the risk were taken by lawyers and by executives on the paper. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Did you write a piece, perhaps not for publication, but for your editors, to underline the extreme fragility of this information? A. They were well aware of that. I mean, this was the only way you could operate in Portugal at that time. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see. A. And other newspapers were doing it. There was no other way of doing it. All I could do was exactly spell out who was saying what. I was saying if it was a police source, this is what the police are saying. Or if it was somebody else, I'd say this is what they were saying. As a journalist, as a reporter, you want to write stories based on fact when you know it's fact, but

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

1	but the only way you could do it, which was to say,	1	the police concerns.
2	"I don't know that this is fact, but this is what people	2	A. Yes.
3	are saying about these different things".	3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you can ask that question and
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, well, I think we've probably	4	then I mean, nobody is suggesting, and he certainly
5	done that point. Thank you.	5	isn't suggesting, as I understand the witness, that any
6	Discussion re procedure	6	of the allegations in relation to DNA or in relation to
7	MR DINGEMANS: May I ask some questions?	7	these other features are established by the facts in the
8	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, you may. Just before you do,	8	record; merely, as I understood it, by what the police
9	Mr Dingemans, I think Mr Sherborne also wants to.	9	believed, even though they couldn't prove a single word
10	I think you would probably rather ask after	10	of it.
11	Mr Sherborne. What's the topic, Mr Sherborne?	11	MR SHERBORNE: Indeed. I don't think Mr Pilditch could
12	MR SHERBORNE: Sir the topic is really one of the topics	12	possibly suggest for one minute that they were true.
13	that you raised in the questions you asked Mr Pilditch.	13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.
14	It's in paragraph 24 of his witness statement, and it	14	MR SHERBORNE: But what he does suggest is that there were
15	refers to his assessment, if I can put it that way, of	15	documents and other material in the police file which
16	the police files. You've heard Mr Pilditch say more	16	support the truth of what he was saying the police were
17	than once now that the police files have revealed that	17	saying, if I can put it that way. And that is simply
18	the articles he was writing were truthful and accurate,	18	incorrect. I can demonstrate that by three articles,
19	and I'd like to pick him up on that comment and take him	19	and I can do it very quickly.
20	through one or two of the articles to demonstrate how	20	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, let me hear what Mr Dingeman
21	that's simply incorrect.	21	says about that.
	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But I don't think he's quite saying	22	MR DINGEMANS: Sir, the whole purpose of your Inquiry is
23	that and I don't think we need to go too much into the	23	inquisitorial. It is at this stage not going into
24	facts. As I understand what you're saying, as	24	dissent of adversarial fact-finding matters. There has
25	I understand what the witness said, he was accurately	25	been no notice from this core participant. Contrast
	Page 97		Page 99
1	reporting that which the police were thinking; he wasn't	1	a matter when we wanted to raise questions of his
2	accurately reporting that which the police could	2	witnesses, we would put them through counsel to the
3	actually prove, because that's not what the police were	3	Inquiry, and we respectfully submit that you would
4	telling him.	4	permit this whole Inquiry to be hijacked into
5	MR SHERBORNE: What he says in his statement, sir, is:	5	fact-finding matters which are not suitable for this
6	"Under the Portuguese system, the authorities	6	stage of this process.
7	released the official police file"	7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand the point, but I have
8	Then he refers to the documents in there, then says:	8	raised concerns, as you heard at the very end of the
9	"Through the release of those documents and	9	witness's evidence.
10	subsequent legal actions in Portugal it is now a matter	10	MR DINGEMANS: Yes.
11	of public record that the reports I was writing between	11	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The witness has made it clear the
12	September 2007 and January 2008 were truthful and	12	limit of his reporting. It's probably not going to
13	accurate."	13	advance the customs, practice and ethics analysis to
14		14	look at whether the way in which the allegations
15	So that is a fairly sweeping statement and it is one		
1 2 1	which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful	15	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and
16	which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so.	15 16	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that
17	which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then	16 17	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand
17 18	which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to	16 17 18	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the
17 18 19	which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann.	16 17 18 19	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression
17 18 19 20	which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann. MR DINGEMANS: Sir, may I make submissions to my learned	16 17 18 19 20	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression given, I don't think it's appropriate to prevent
17 18 19 20 21	 which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann. MR DINGEMANS: Sir, may I make submissions to my learned friend about whether this is appropriate? 	16 17 18 19 20 21	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression given, I don't think it's appropriate to prevent Mr Sherborne from doing that, and maybe he can do it by
17 18 19 20 21	 which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann. MR DINGEMANS: Sir, may I make submissions to my learned friend about whether this is appropriate? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You may, but I think, in the light of 	16 17 18 19 20 21	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression given, I don't think it's appropriate to prevent Mr Sherborne from doing that, and maybe he can do it by way of statement, because I've got the evidence of the
17 18 19 20 21	 which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann. MR DINGEMANS: Sir, may I make submissions to my learned friend about whether this is appropriate? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You may, but I think, in the light of my understanding of the evidence of this witness, the 	16 17 18 19 20 21	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression given, I don't think it's appropriate to prevent Mr Sherborne from doing that, and maybe he can do it by way of statement, because I've got the evidence of the witness on the topic. But to cut it out entirely runs
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	 which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann. MR DINGEMANS: Sir, may I make submissions to my learned friend about whether this is appropriate? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You may, but I think, in the light of my understanding of the evidence of this witness, the truthfulness and accuracy is not intended to reflect the 	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression given, I don't think it's appropriate to prevent Mr Sherborne from doing that, and maybe he can do it by way of statement, because I've got the evidence of the witness on the topic. But to cut it out entirely runs the risk of leaving a potentially unfair picture.
 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	 which, very simply, can be demonstrated to be untruthful and inaccurate, and I would ask you to be able to do so. I can do it, as I say, relatively shortly, and then there are one or two supplemental questions I'd like to ask him on behalf of Dr Kate and Dr Gerry McCann. MR DINGEMANS: Sir, may I make submissions to my learned friend about whether this is appropriate? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You may, but I think, in the light of my understanding of the evidence of this witness, the 	 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	dribbled out of the Portuguese police were picked up and reported, but on the other hand, in the same way that I've been content for various core participants to stand up and make a correcting statement simply so that the public domain so there isn't a misleading impression given, I don't think it's appropriate to prevent Mr Sherborne from doing that, and maybe he can do it by way of statement, because I've got the evidence of the witness on the topic. But to cut it out entirely runs

1	I take your point.	1	it, even if it was only last night.
2	MR DINGEMANS: My other point is questions to this witness.	2	MR SHERBORNE: Sir, when a witness seeks to reinforce
3	There's been no notice that he was going to be asked	3	evidence he's given in response to a question you've
4	questions on behalf of this core participant. I have no	4	asked, it assumes far more importance than it would do
5	problems, and, sir, it's entirely up to you whether you	5	in the pages of the witness statement that have been
6	permit people to make statements, but in our submission	6	provided.
7	there shouldn't be a practice of standing up to ask	7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Identify to me your three examples,
8	questions simply because they want to ask further	8	please.
9	details when there's been no notice to the relevant	9	MR SHERBORNE: Sir, I can do it by way of a speech.
10	witness.	10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I don't want you to make
11	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, I don't know whether this is	11	a speech. I want you to identify the three examples.
12	a topic which Mr Sherborne informed Mr Jay about.	12	MR SHERBORNE: The three examples are firstly, and they're
13	MR DINGEMANS: He didn't, according to the information	13	examples that I tried to pick on examples as Mr Jay
14	I have.	14	was going through, which are not the same articles.
15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I certainly required all core	15	October 1, 2007, which is an article I don't have the
16	participants to do that, so that we could make	16	exhibits, so I can't tell you the page. It's entitled
17	a decision, and I think that was the approach that	17	"Now police say she fell down the steps: the hunt for
18	I adopted.	18	Madeleine". It's one that Mr Pilditch co-wrote with
19	MR DINGEMANS: Sir, that's only my point on this point. The	19	Mr Evans, but on this occasion, since his name comes
20	only reason for objecting is if one is trying to prepare	20	first, I assume he will accept that he was responsible
21	fairly witnesses for what may happen and then people	21	for it.
22	decide to pick up points that they haven't decided or	22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Let's just see it. I'm concerned
23	bothered to notify to counsel to the Inquiry.	23	with the facts so that an impression should be an
24	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Well, Mr Sherborne, that		incorrect impression should be put right. So 1 October,
25	seems a not unfair point.	25	did you say?
20	Page 101	20	Page 103
1	MR SHERBORNE: Can I deal with that point before I deal with	1	MR SHERBORNE: Yes:
2	my substantive one, and that's this. You'll appreciate	2	"Now police say she fell down the steps" is the
3	that this witness statement was only provided I think to	3	front page headline, "The hunt for Madeleine". And the
4	us yesterday afternoon. That's the first I saw of this	4	opening words are:
5	witness statement.	5	"Madalaina MaCann's novents faced new smeans
	LODD HIGTICE LEVESON, 14 h		"Madeleine McCann's parents faced new smears
6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'd be very surprised, but	6	yesterday after it was reported their daughter died
6 7	MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago.		
6 7 8			yesterday after it was reported their daughter died
7	MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago.	7	yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are
7 8	MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend.	7 8	yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident
7 8 9	MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two	7 8 9	yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry
7 8 9 10	MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago.I can't talk about my learned friend.MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon.	7 8 9 10	yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy."
7 8 9 10 11	MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend.MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon.LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.	7 8 9 10 11	yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right?
7 8 9 10 11 12	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser 	7 8 9 10 11 12	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled"
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out. stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight of the Portuguese police file. That is why I stand to 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but MR SHERBORNE: There is also
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight of the Portuguese police file. That is why I stand to ask those questions. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, Mr Sherborne, that doesn't 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but MR SHERBORNE: There is also LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But are you able to say that the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight of the Portuguese police file. That is why I stand to ask those questions. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, Mr Sherborne, that doesn't work, because, as you will know, the statement would be 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out. stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but MR SHERBORNE: There is also LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But are you able to say that the police were not putting that out? MR SHERBORNE: There is nothing in the police file which
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight of the Portuguese police file. That is why I stand to ask those questions. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, Mr Sherborne, that doesn't 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out. stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but MR SHERBORNE: There is also LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But are you able to say that the police were not putting that out?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight of the Portuguese police file. That is why I stand to ask those questions. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, Mr Sherborne, that doesn't work, because, as you will know, the statement would be going on the Internet in any event, so it's a public document for all to see, and if the point had to be 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered out, stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but MR SHERBORNE: There is also LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But are you able to say that the police were not putting that out? MR SHERBORNE: There is nothing in the police file which suggests that the police had found evidence that Madeleine had been harmed in any way.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 MR DINGEMANS: It was provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago. I can't talk about my learned friend. MR SHERBORNE: It may have been provided to the Inquiry two weeks ago, I did not see it until yesterday afternoon. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. MR SHERBORNE: But that perhaps is a point of lesser importance. A point of greater importance is that this paragraph 24 was a matter that only was raised by you, sir, in your question to Mr Pilditch, and that's when he relied on it to positively reinforce the fact that what he had published by way of reports of what the police were saying was truthful and accurate, having had sight of the Portuguese police file. That is why I stand to ask those questions. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, Mr Sherborne, that doesn't work, because, as you will know, the statement would be going on the Internet in any event, so it's a public 	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 yesterday after it was reported their daughter died falling downstairs. It is claimed Portuguese police are 100 per cent certain Madeleine was killed in an accident at her family's holiday apartment and Kate and Gerry covered up the tragedy." LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right? MR SHERBORNE: "The theory is Madeleine, four, wandered ou stumbled" LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, but what's the point? MR SHERBORNE: The point is this: there is nothing in the Portuguese police file to suggest that Madeleine had been harmed in any way. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but MR SHERBORNE: There is also LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But are you able to say that the police were not putting that out? MR SHERBORNE: There is nothing in the police file which suggests that the police had found evidence that

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

1	different. Are you able to say that the police didn't	1	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, you can consider over the
2	put that out?	2	no, I won't ask you to do that.
3	MR SHERBORNE: What I'm able to say is there is no	3	A. Could I just say something in relation to this?
4	suggestion the police were putting that out in the	4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.
5	police file.	5	A. It's not just the police file that I'm referring to
6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.	6	here. I'm talking about statements that have been made
7	MR SHERBORNE: That's why I say this is not about disproving	7	in courts, and in fact the chief the head of the
8	that the articles were true or that the facts suggested	8	police inquiry has written a book, and I'm talking about
9	were true because it's not even stated they are. It's	9	a whole series of different sources of information that
10	about disproving that there was evidence or that the	10	are now in the public domain
11	police were suggesting there was evidence to support	11	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Oh, well, then
12	these allegations. And there is nothing in the police	12	A that weren't in the public domain at that time. It's
13	files to suggest the police were suggesting that.	13	not just the police file in isolation I'm talking about.
14	If one turns then to 17 October, this is a point	14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Then actually your sentence is quite
15	that was raised not in relation to this article, this	15	wrong in paragraph 24, because your sentence in
16	article is Mr Pilditch's article alone, entitled	16	paragraph 24 says:
17	"Parents' car hid a corpse. 'It was under carpet in	17	"Through the release of those documents [that's the
18	boot', say police", and refers to the DNA evidence.	18	police file] and subsequent legal actions in Portugal,
19	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.	19	it's now a matter of public record that the reports I'm
20	MR SHERBORNE: It's right to say that there is nothing in	20	writing were truthful and accurate."
21	the police files to suggest that Madeleine's DNA was	21	A. Yes.
22	found in the car. Indeed, as the police files show, and	22	MR DINGEMANS: Sir, the legal action was concerned to put
23	as Mr Pilditch would know, the McCanns only hired the	23	My learned friend Mr Sherborne was seeking to
24	car after Madeleine had disappeared.	24	cross-examine on a false premise anyway, because he's
25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, but that's the same point abou	t 25	ignored the legal actions.
	Page 105		Page 107
1	the conclusive/inconclusive DNA, isn't it?	1	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I've got the point. But more
2	MR SHERBORNE: It's a similar point, but as I say, what the	2	significantly it's, as I expressed the view, slightly
3	police files show is that no DNA of Madeleine was ever	3	dependent upon the brief that Mr Pilditch was fulfilling
4	found in the car, so there's nothing in the police files	4	the extent to which decisions thereafter were made,
5	to support the suggestion that DNA of hers was found,	5	which were appropriate.
6	which is what is stated in the article.	6	Right. I understand the point.
7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, and the third point?	7	MR SHERBORNE: With respect, sir, I wasn't allowed to
8	MR SHERBORNE: And the third for example relates to one that	8	cross-examine. If I had cross-examined, it would not
9	I think Mr Jay did take Mr Pilditch to, which is the	9	have been on a false premise.
10	priest bans Madeleine, the 12 December article. It	10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not going to get into the issue
11	relate to this. I don't know whether you have that	11	between you and Mr Dingemans. I'm not going to go down
12	article.	12	the route of trying to unpick what one Portuguese police
13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.	13	officer said, either in a book or in a legal proceedings
14	MR SHERBORNE: It refers to the investigators becoming	14	or in the record. Everybody is agreed that there is
15	convinced that Kate had confessed to the priest, and of	15	absolutely no foundation at all for the allegation that
16	course again there is nothing in the police file to say	16	emerged throughout the public hearing throughout the
17	that Kate McCann had confessed to the priest. Indeed,	17	press at this time, that Dr and Dr McCann were involved
18	the witness statement of the priest makes perfectly	18	in any way in any inappropriate conduct in relation to
19	plain, and that is in the police file, that no such	19	the disappearance of their daughter.
20	confession was given.	20	So that doesn't need to be established for me and in
21	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right, I understand the point.	21	the same way that I wasn't going to go into what
22	Thank you.	22	happened in relation to the City Slickers column, this
23	Mr Pilditch, I am going to ask you the question in	23	is very much a side issue. I understand the point, and
24	this way: you've obviously seen this entire file.	24	I understand the reason why it is very important for
25	A. I've seen it some time ago. I have seen it.	25	your clients to make that position critically clear, and
25	Page 106		Page 108

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

I

	• • · · • • •
1	I am happy to emphasise it and I am sure that
2	Mr Dingemans wouldn't want to say anything to the
3	contrary, and he is nodding, so I put that into the
4	record. But further than that I simply don't consider
5	it necessary to go.
6	If I say, because of my natural sympathy for Dr and
7	Dr McCann, that it's appropriate, then actually I have
8	opened a door which I cannot prevent other people from
9	seeking to examine in different ways and I haven't
10	sufficient requirement to go into these areas to justify
11	it.
12	MR SHERBORNE: Sir, I accept that. It is simply this. You
13	need to consider, obviously, in terms of the culture,
14	practices and ethics of the press, whether it was
15	responsible or, as one might say, utterly irresponsible
16	to publish this kind of information.
17	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think you'll find that the question
18	I asked was designed to that very issue.
19	MR SHERBORNE: I understand that, but it is the statement
20	you've seen in paragraph 24 of the way in which it's
20	being said these stories were being put together that is
21	necessary to be tested and that's why I asked for it to
22	be tested in the way I did.
24	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. Right. Thank you very
25	much, we'll resume at 2.05 pm.
	Page 109
1	(1.05 pm)
2	(1.05 pm)
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	Page 110

A	addressed 9:1 45:10	31:14	106:6,10,12	35:16 42:2 58:18,20 63:21	board 63:7 boat 60:15	buts 39:7 buy 30:17,19
abducted 55:20	adds 80:13	answer 22:5,11 31:20 58:18,20	articles 63:25 76:17 81:7	67:25 72:19	boat 60:15 body 71:14 78:7	buy-ups 43:22
92:10	adhered 67:18	79:18	97:18,20 99:18	76:19 95:21	78:13 81:22	buzz 22:22 49:7
abduction 90:2	adjournment	answerable 9:10	103:14 105:8	background	bog-standard	49:17,20
abductor 56:8 able 8:15 13:20	45:20	answered 17:15	artist 28:18	3:25 13:13	14:2	bylined 23:16
22:5,7 40:10	adopted 101:18	92:1	Asda 31:4	83:25	book 29:20 107:8	bylines 72:6
58:9,14,24	advance 6:2,12	anticipate 47:1	asked 4:9,17	Backwards	108:13	
63:3 71:19	27:24 100:13	anyone's 31:20	28:4 31:11	81:11	boot 78:14	C
84:13 94:5	advantages	anyway 17:9	38:9 45:4 96:3	bans 106:10	105:18	called 2:8 36:21
98:16 104:20	64:25	22:7 107:24	97:13 101:3	barking 91:23	bore 55:8	campaign 67:24
105:1,3	adversarial 48:16,18 99:24	apart 9:11 apartment 55:24	103:4 109:18 109:22	Barr 1:3,4,8,9 6:15 23:11	boss 31:17 bosses 18:22	Canary 13:19
abroad 3:22	advice 37:25	104:9	asking 39:3	41:1,14,15	19:8,11	capable 45:25 capitalised 38:15
absolutely 3:7 11:2 20:25	40:16 42:17,25	apologise 38:25	41:18 47:25	44:2 45:14,22	bother 76:20	38:17
27:12 29:7	43:19,25 61:4	apologised 38:24	aspect 46:25	46:9 49:2	bothered 101:23	captured 41:11
87:12 91:5	advising 37:19	apology 29:2	aspects 51:14	barriers 58:23	bottom 6:25 8:3	car 72:12 79:16
108:15	88:8	apparent 15:9	66:19	based 23:4 32:19	10:1 22:13	79:20,24
academic 5:1	affair 22:15	57:3	assemble 77:8	64:16 95:18	40:7 52:24	105:17,22,24
accept 44:13	affairs 52:7 affirmed 1:7	apparently 59:6 59:11 81:17	assembled 77:22 assert 23:12	96:23	79:12 bought 28:8 36:4	106:4
103:20 109:12	afternoon 16:25	82:10 83:4	assert 23:12 assertion 23:3	basically 61:24 62:1 71:4	36:24	care 7:5,11
acceptable 15:5	102:4,10	appeals 51:24	assertions 49:25	73:21	bounced 67:17	career 1:21,23 carpet 105:17
accepted 15:4,17	Age 2:2,5	54:2 61:24	assessed 27:25	basis 4:8 15:7	boxes 40:4	carried 38:22
accessing 51:19 accident 71:13	agency 50:25	82:20	assessing 27:18	21:24 32:13	breach 7:7 8:2,7	80:3 82:6
81:20 104:8	agents 19:1	appear 7:10	assessment 82:8	58:2 83:8 91:1	8:9	carry 40:17
accorded 66:1	43:11	20:20 33:16	82:12 93:22	battles 9:8	breached 7:1	carrying 13:21
account 6:6	aggressively	47:10	97:15	beating 9:22	breaches 7:22	cars 71:5 73:20
25:17 33:13	68:13	appeared 14:10	assist 22:6 44:7	Beatson 5:22	8:14	case 7:23 22:6
39:2 43:16	ago 14:19,20 22:1 25:2	18:15 appetite 38:19	assisting 11:1 Associates 3:11	44:24 becoming 106:14	break 41:6,8,13 breakdown	25:10 37:4 46:25 51:22
48:23 49:1	41:23,23 63:18	application 6:19	23:8	began 1:23	45:22	52:1,21 53:3
accountants 4:14	76:21 102:7,10	applied 8:6	assume 86:16	beginning 24:22	brief 20:1 58:5	53:11 57:9
accuracy 59:24 60:2 85:19,21	106:25	apply 37:19	103:20	37:10	108:3	60:7 62:17
89:3 98:24	agree 7:14 48:17	appointed 67:15	assumed 28:24	begins 25:3	briefed 4:8	68:2,16 70:6
accurate 19:3	93:5 96:3	appreciate 61:3	assumes 103:4	behalf 25:9 43:3	briefing 65:23	83:21 94:22
45:25 58:25	agreed 34:12	90:21 102:2	assumption 27:1	47:7 98:19	briefings 58:7	cast 74:18
61:11 97:18	67:16 68:23 108:14	approach 101:17	72:17	101:4	bring 34:7,18,24 bringing 34:9	catchphrase
98:13 102:18	agreement 67:20	approached 56:20	attached 62:6 89:18	behave 15:4 belief 1:17	brings 65:20	28:9 cause 61:6
107:20	ahead 54:22	appropriate	attack 35:22	beliefs 41:19	Britain 53:5	cause 01.0 caveats 62:6
accurately 97:25 98:2	airport 71:3	11:20 98:21	attempt 24:8	believe 46:7	75:21 80:3	89:18
accusation 54:16	72:11	100:20 108:5	attitude 14:25	68:23 80:20	British 71:1 83:4	celebrities 13:24
accusing 65:25	Alan 36:22	109:7	attitudes 33:9,9	82:3	83:11,14	18:25
achieve 34:1	albeit 49:11	approval 43:4,10	attributed 74:24	believed 83:16	brought 39:6	celebrity 17:1
acknowledged	alerted 54:6	approve 73:1	attribution	83:22 99:9	40:2 45:18	19:1 30:4
46:7 49:1	alien 4:17 allegation 45:15	area 19:19 57:6 areas 55:11	74:25 August 21:6	believing 46:17 berating 34:8	Browne 44:4,5 44:21 45:9,25	celebrity's 14:14
acquire 38:18	108:15	109:10	Australian 18:13	best 1:16 45:1,10	46:13 47:6,16	21:20 cent 61:16 104:8
acquires 66:21 acquisition	allegations 99:6	arguido 64:3	18:14,15,17	57:25 59:4,9	47:17,22 48:20	century 82:14
37:19	100:14 105:12	65:5 66:2	20:11	78:22	49:8,17 50:3,4	certain 61:10
Act 2:23,24	allow 49:11	arguidos 64:14	author 72:25	better 5:6 11:5	building 49:6	62:18 77:14
acting 7:6 48:20	allowed 65:7	64:22 89:22	74:3	69:10	buildings 71:7	104:8
action 29:2 62:12	108:7	arising 1:20	authorities 83:20	beyond 48:24	built 29:25	certainly 2:13
107:22	all-staff 34:8 alongside 2:4	arranged 12:23	84:2 89:23 98:6	87:8 Bhoyrul 2:5 11:6	bull 38:12 bullet 7:18	10:14 11:10
actions 98:10	ambassador	arrangement 13:2	authority 29:24	24:5 38:4	bundle 6:17	13:8 24:19,19 32:6 33:21
107:18,25	71:1	arrested 65:14	available 5:14	46:17,22	11:12 18:10	39:18 40:13
active 65:12 activities 13:17	amount 16:23	arrived 56:4	aware 20:12	big 12:17 19:19	23:23 35:18	43:1,9 52:18
14:1 16:2	92:4	70:24 72:11	31:23 37:21	43:21 66:14	46:10 50:14	56:9,10 62:12
activity 14:21	analysed 80:17	article 18:11	96:14	bit 4:20 12:6	81:10	76:1 99:4
actual 21:23	80:21	21:5 22:13	axe 36:14	71:4 72:2	business 1:25 2:1	101:15
66:19	analysis 81:24	23:2,23 35:20	B	85:12,17,18,24	2:2,5,6,9 4:24	chain 9:7,11
add 91:8 92:14	100:13 Anil 2:5 11:6,7	35:20 69:4,7 73:6 79:13,14		86:21 88:2 bites 37:8	20:2,3,4 31:1 39:10 43:13	19:11,17 88:12
added 24:4 75:2	Alli 2:3 11:0,7 11:12 24:5	95:9 103:15	back 10:23 23:22 24:23 26:17	black 67:24	businesses 55:7	94:13 chains 88:19
addition 56:19 address 45:6	anonymous	105:15,16,16	27:13 31:6	blow 34:23	56:1	chaired 36:21
auuress 45:0	- J>	,,,				

	•	•	•	•	•	•
challenge 44:14	13:20 16:17	common 14:9	85:6,17,22	27:24 28:13,23	58:24	67:10 90:8
challenged 48:1	20:17 30:14	22:2 26:15	86:2,23	29:5,21 34:25	crisis 43:14	deal 4:2 5:23
48:15	75:4 84:9	34:17 43:10	confidence 69:20	37:10,17 43:4	critical 48:1	10:13 12:3
challenging	closely 19:9	communication	confident 60:9	43:9 72:2,24	critically 108:25	24:18 102:1,1
51:14,17	coach 22:17	88:19,20	confirm 94:12	77:7 88:9 90:5	criticism 7:10	dealing 2:16,17
change 33:24	coauthored	companies 2:19	confirmation	core 45:12 48:21	criticisms 47:13	6:3 32:10
changed 76:19	72:24	7:24 36:4,19	60:24 63:4	99:25 100:17	cross-examina	35:16 37:23
changes 89:24	code 4:7,12,19	38:15 40:10	confirmed 60:5	101:4,15	44:15,17 47:8	43:3 51:24
changing 11:13	5:1,3,10,14,16	company 4:14	conflict 20:21	corners 39:13	cross-examine	53:18 56:15
29:16,21	5:18 6:7 7:2,6	7:2 8:17 13:7	confusion 54:10	corporate 4:2,4	44:8 107:24	60:6
character 42:3	7:9,23 8:2,6,7	18:5 28:7,10	54:20	4:12,15 8:1	108:8	dealings 6:13
characterisation	8:9,14 37:11	36:21,21	conjecture 22:12	13:16 43:12,19	cross-examined	11:7
53:15 90:5	37:16	compensation	connected 55:6	corpse 105:17	40:14 46:4	dealt 56:22
characterise	colleague 2:5	68:24	55:25	correct 1:16,24	108:8	Dear 11:20
49:9 78:22	24:7,12	competency	conscious 47:21	2:10 3:4,12	cross-examining	December 1:1
characterised	colonial 71:6	91:25	consider 32:22	8:10 50:21,22	48:25	69:10 74:18
80:11	colour 71:4	competitive	107:1 109:4,13	51:2,3,11,12	Crown 3:1 49:4	81:13 82:25
characteristics	73:17,24 74:6	34:20	consideration	52:4,9 60:23	Cruddace 27:22	84:5 106:10
42:6,6	75:9	compiled 22:25	39:24	61:16 74:21	28:4,12 40:5	decide 32:17,18
charged 2:17,18	column 2:6,8,11	55:2	considered 14:2	89:5	cult 11:21 29:25	101:22
2:21	2:20 3:19	compiling 72:3	15:22 17:25	correcting	29:25	decided 101:22
charges 48:8	10:15,17,19	73:10	18:2 44:6 47:2	100:18	cultural 33:8	deciding 47:9
charisma 11:23	20:3 27:23	complain 83:23	considering 76:2	correctly 31:21	83:17	decision 30:18
charm 11:23	28:2,14,21	complaints 61:1	conspiracy 2:21	correlation	culture 4:10 6:2	33:1 88:14
charming 42:3	29:5 31:2,5,8	completely 65:3	consumer 43:18	39:21	6:12 40:23	90:22 101:17
check 28:14	37:1,20 38:2,3	90:15	contact 11:17	correspondent	109:13	decisions 31:18
checked 67:13	38:6,11,14	concentrated	23:9 57:4,8,13	19:22 20:11	cured 45:23	48:22 94:13
chief 107:7	39:6,6,15 40:1	43:21	58:7 84:16	Council 5:5	custom 37:9	96:9 108:4
child 63:22 90:1	40:2 45:3	concept 4:17	contacts 57:7	50:24	customs 100:13	declared 61:2
92:5,10	108:22	39:5	59:17	counsel 48:2	100:25	89:22
Chris 20:9 23:16	columnist 11:5	concern 8:25	contains 50:16	100:2 101:23	cut 74:9,10	deemed 32:21
Chronicle 40:8	16:18 36:22	27:19 44:23	contempt 65:20	counterparts	100:23	67:20
40:11,15	columnists 9:6	46:23,25 94:4	content 2:9	14:11		defamation
chronologically	columns 37:24	94:7	31:11 100:17	country 51:10	D	28:14
81:12	come 5:9 11:8	concerned 17:15	contention 36:15	82:3,14 86:12	da 84:18	defamatory
chronology 82:5	15:10 16:20,24	37:7 44:20	47:11	course 5:4,9 13:5	daily 2:6 4:1,5	63:25 67:20
circumstances	21:19 25:25	46:1 66:11	contentious	30:15 32:11	4:22 5:15,20	68:23 93:9
93:17	30:6 33:10,18	68:25 83:23	17:10	47:23 48:6	6:8 8:20,23	defence 20:11
city 2:8 8:4 10:6	33:20 38:15	93:20 96:4	contents 1:14	57:25 88:8	11:17 15:7,24	defend 63:3
10:10,16 12:23	39:10 47:4	103:22 107:22	35:23	106:16	17:24 20:2	defendable
13:12 20:5	58:20 61:25	concerns 90:24	context 67:1	courses 5:7	21:10,19 22:9	17:11
24:4 37:20,20	63:17 66:12	99:1 100:8	75:10	court 3:1 49:4	27:4 40:15	defines 66:22
108:22	76:18 89:17	conclude 32:10	continue 3:22	65:20	51:1,2,4 57:8	definition 30:22
claim 95:11	comes 32:1,2	concluded 7:4	continued 36:7	courtroom 49:5	57:13	degree 27:14
claimed 104:7	45:11 103:19	conclusion 45:10	contradictory	courts 49:12	damages 17:14	deleted 14:14
claiming 95:10	comfortable	47:9	90:11,12	107:7	29:4 93:8 96:6	delicate 48:22
claims 93:8 96:6	50:12	conclusions 45:1	contrary 2:23	cover 18:18 53:7	date 41:12 69:7	deliver 34:5
Clarence 56:17	coming 52:20	49:14	48:2 109:3	53:9,13,14	dated 35:20	demanded 7:8
67:15	56:14 61:15,17	conclusive 78:7	Contrast 99:25	coverage 10:16	74:18 81:13	demonstrate
clause 85:15	71:6 90:19	80:14 81:25	contravene 2:22	covered 81:21	daughter 70:14	97:20 99:18
clear 8:15 9:2	94:11,21	conclusively	contribution	104:10	79:16 91:3,3	demonstrated
15:11 27:6	command 9:7,11	78:13	10:20 73:2	covering 51:15	104:6 108:19	98:15
33:3 35:1	19:17	conclusive/inc	control 9:7 36:8	52:8 63:10	daughter's 81:22	demonstrates
54:25 56:22	commas 90:3	106:1	conversations	cowardice 42:7	David 50:9,13	46:14
68:1 69:14	comment 64:17	condition 95:9	23:6 62:4,18	Cowell 42:20	day 10:3 11:16	demonstration
88:6 91:5	67:21 68:4	conduct 6:7 7:6	86:11 88:24	co-author 69:12	11:16 13:5	14:8
100:11 108:25	71:18 73:1	108:18	89:15	co-columnist	15:9 31:8	denied 48:10
clearly 25:18	97:19	conducted 6:20	convicted 3:1	38:4	36:25 38:5	Dennis 3:13
client 44:6	commented	44:25 47:3	convince 32:13	co-operate 57:4	53:23 56:25	department 17:5
clients 42:17,20	67:22	75:3	convinced 85:4	co-operation	57:2 58:16	17:8
42:23,25 43:2	comments 6:23	conducting 27:1	87:10 106:15	53:19	61:20 62:1	dependent 108:3
43:3,13,20	7:11 20:20	conference 9:20	cooperation	co-wrote 103:18	63:13 70:24	Depending 19:15
44:11 108:25	63:7	confessed 85:4	53:21	created 67:4	89:15,16 90:13	deputy 19:18,23
Clifford 3:11	commission 7:1	106:15,17	cope 39:25	credibility 49:11	90:14 92:22	describe 34:2
	8:12	confession 84:25	copied 46:9	crime 57:7,10	93:21,22	49:20
23:8 42:14,16				01.01		1 11 1 10 00
Clive 23:19	Commission's	86:3 106:20	copies 5:14	81:21	days 38:7 56:11	described 10:23
			copies 5:14 copy 4:7 5:16	81:21 criminal 2:23		described 10:23 20:18 29:13

Leveson Inquiry

49:6 55:23	97:9 98:20	98:9 99:15	editorial 18:3,6	environment	exclusive 30:20	99:24 100:5
49.0 55.25 95:9	97:998:20 99:20,22	107:17	29:8 36:8	39:10,11	exclusives 34:5,9	Fagge 70:24 72:3
description 35:8	100:10 101:2	doing 9:14 10:8	editors 8:25 9:20	episode 37:8	34:18,25 43:22	72:10,21,25
55:16,22	101:13,19	10:22 15:16	15:6,17 17:25	equivalent 64:23	Executive 8:1	73:5 74:3
,						
descriptions	102:7 107:22	21:13 25:18	18:1 21:16	Eriksson 22:16	executives 4:15 13:25 18:3	Fagge's 70:21
55:14 56:12	108:11 109:2	39:17 58:5	30:8,11 32:13	especially 3:17		failed 41:5 81:25
designed 2:8	direct 9:4 19:17	61:24 68:17	96:12	15:7 30:4 34:5	24:9 96:10	fair 15:22,22
109:18	20:21	73:8 93:23	editorship 16:12	establish 70:4	exhibit 68:20	44:11 47:6
desk 9:8,9,17	direction 89:24	94:2 96:17,18	editor's 7:11	71:12	exhibits 103:16	48:15 49:9
12:13,22,23,25	90:4,15	100:21	88:14 90:21	established	expand 48:12	53:15 60:1
14:21,23 16:19	directions 93:21	domain 88:3	effect 27:25	78:12 99:7	expats 55:7	61:11 66:23
16:22,24 18:23	directly 9:12	96:2 100:19	effectively 60:17	108:20	expect 36:5	68:10 71:10
19:12,13,22	44:6 56:14	107:10,12	65:4,14	eternity 49:16	37:21 51:23	77:24 88:6
20:5 21:11,12	57:4 58:14	door 109:8	eight 12:24 29:20	ethical 8:19,22	52:19 91:24	90:5 93:2,18
21:15,16 22:3	66:8 67:17	doubt 20:23	50:25 76:3	15:3 33:9,18	experience 17:9	fairly 98:14
25:12 26:10,13	disadvantaged	77:15	81:23	39:18	33:6 35:13	101:21
37:20 38:8	10:12	downstairs	eighth 80:9	ethics 4:5 37:9	94:1	fallen 7:7
61:19 62:2,5,7	disagreements	104:7	either 72:2	39:17,20	expert 62:16	falling 104:7
62:13,18 63:1	83:19	dozen 48:7	108:13	100:13,25	experts 82:22	false 95:19
63:6 72:3 73:8	disappearance	Dr 52:14 65:1	electric 28:8	109:14	explain 44:10	107:24 108:9
88:21,21 89:5	53:23 57:15	84:25 86:3	elicit 25:23	Europe 53:6	61:13 89:16,18	familiar 1:14
89:10,16	60:15 67:7	98:19,19	elicited 24:18	European 82:14	explained 26:3	5:10
desks 12:22 14:6	70:14 108:19	108:17,17	25:19	Evans 103:19	61:21 64:21	family's 104:9
despite 21:1	disappeared	109:6,7	else's 36:20	event 66:3	65:15 71:22	far 5:8 15:8
58:23 70:15	91:3 92:5	draw 86:21	email 28:16	102:23	92:18	25:13 36:18
detail 4:20 44:19	105:24	drawing 85:12	emailed 72:18,20	Everybody	explaining 62:5	44:25 49:14
45:6	disbelieved 3:6	drawn 86:21	72:21 73:2	108:14	63:14,16 65:23	78:16,18 81:4
detailed 47:19	disciplinary 25:3	dribbled 100:15	emails 34:8,10	everybody's	67:23 80:7	81:25 92:10
details 11:16	25:6	drive 66:12	34:15 35:2	53:10	81:2 86:25	93:20 103:4
30:4 51:22	disclosure 40:7 40:17	dropped 38:5,6,9	embarrassing	evidence 5:18	94:10,11	Faro 71:2
60:14 101:9	40:17 discomfiture	Drs 56:20 67:17	17:12 29:1	6:1,11 17:11	explains 48:12	fatally 53:22 82:17
detectives 68:16	61:18 62:25	DTI 45:17 46:15 47:5	embraced 48:8	20:21 30:7 33:3 34:11	explanation 46:8 89:20	82:17 Father 86:6
75:21 76:5,10			emerged 56:10			
83:3 94:22	discuss 17:1,2	due 60:10 62:9	108:16	37:10 40:18	explicitly 48:10	fear 83:9
develop 58:9	51:21	duty-bound 87:2	emotional 84:24	41:20 42:9,11	explore 6:15	fearful 83:4
developed 58:13	discussed 16:5,9	E	91:5,8 92:4,14	44:13 45:11	12:10	feature 38:9
developing 58:13	18:6 23:17		92:18	47:11,20,20	exposed 96:6	featured 5:7
development	39:23 61:18	earlier 6:4 27:14	emphasise 109:1	48:3,14 49:6	Express 3:19	43:18
64:11 66:14	discussing 10:4 14:5 66:20	81:10 82:16	enabled 59:23 60:1	49:10,14,20,22 50:17 67:25	51:2,4	features 44:22 99:7
developments 58:25 59:21		89:2			expressed 108:2	
	Discussion 44:3 97:6	early 9:8 21:22	encouraged	70:15 75:5	extensive 44:14	February 51:9 feel 53:2 61:8
67:10 90:8		41:6 54:19	39:11	78:12,16,21	extent 7:10 31:10	
91:22 94:14	discussions	56:3,11 61:23	ended 31:8	79:2,3,8,15	65:24 108:4	feelings 41:2
dialogue 58:10	62:20,20 66:17 89:10	63:22	engaging 14:21 42:2	82:1,23 95:6	extreme 96:13	feet 12:12,25 21:13
dialogues 61:20		easily 19:10		95:21 98:23,25	extremely 30:2 33:23 38:23	
dictate 90:4 died 71:13 81:20	displayed 5:19 42:5	34:20 44:16	England 22:17 English 65:11	100:9,22 103:3 104:23 105:10	eye 74:18	fell 103:17 104:2 fellow 2:4 11:5
104:6	disposed 71:14	easy 45:12 83:15	enjoyable 33:23	105:11,18	eyes 31:20	24:4
difference 36:2	81:21	Edge 3:14 edit 61:4	enjoyable 35.25 enjoyed 10:14	exactly 23:15	eyes 51.20	felt 25:7 61:12
differences	dispossessed		13:7	56:3 77:4,6	F	62:15,16 84:24
64:22 65:13	33:14	edited 11:21 12:2	enormous 11:23	96:18	face 29:1 42:8	96:8
83:18	disproving 105:7	edition 29:18 editor 7:22 8:5,8	enquiries 55:11	examination	66:6 72:23	fight 33:14
different 10:15	105:10	9:19 11:18	enquiry 55:12	79:5	faced 104:5	figure 46:8,16,19
13:12 65:3	dispute 69:21	12:2 16:9	56:1,10 61:23	examine 109:9	fact 6:6 8:16	47:12
80:18 82:24	dissent 99:24	17:17 18:1,2	68:4 95:3	examined 49:12	10:13,17 15:12	file 77:2 95:13,16
90:12,15 92:25	DNA 70:15	19:14,14,15,15	ensure 7:5 8:5,13	79:4	34:24 46:18	98:7 99:15
93:16,21 96:2	78:11,16,21	19:14,14,15,15	14:15	examining 82:22	49:12 60:12	102:19 104:16
96:25 97:3	79:1,3,15,19	19:18,19,23,23	enters 92:15	example 13:16	62:4 78:21	104:22 105:5
105:1 107:9	80:22 81:24	24:8 29:11,13	enthusiastically	14:4 20:2 34:7	83:4 86:15	106:16,19,24
109:9	95:8 99:6	30:23 31:17,17	38:23	37:21 43:16	95:7 96:23,23	107:5,13,18
difficult 48:21	105:18,21	31:24,25 32:5	entire 106:24	45:14 75:20	97:2 102:16	filed 72:2 73:24
difficulties 60:25	106:1,3,5	32:7,17,18,21	entirely 15:17	95:22 106:8	107:7	75:3
61:5 89:4,13	document 46:9	33:5 35:22	45:25 48:17	examples 103:7	factor 91:11	files 94:24 97:16
difficulty 2:14,15	102:24	42:4 69:21,24	49:9 93:2	103:11,12,13	facts 53:17 97:24	97:17 105:13
63:5	documentation	69:25 70:7,9,9	100:23 101:5	103:13	98:25 99:7	105:21,22
dilemma 53:12	95:15	70:10 88:21,24	entitled 64:24	excellent 44:1	103:23 105:8	105:21,22
		90:25	103:16 105:16	exchange 86:17	fact-finding	fill 26:18
Dingemans 97.7	documents 9A A					
Dingemans 97:7	documents 98:8	90.23	105.10 105.10	8	nuce minung	

final 52:6 70:11	form 44:17 82:12	35:11 42:1	23:4	42:10 49:4	Hipwell 1:5,7,9	103:4
89:20	91:24	52:10,13 85:1	governance 4:2,4	52:24 54:13	1:12 4:21 21:7	important 14:22
finally 42:13	formal 6:7 52:2	86:4 93:13	4:12,15 13:16	64:12 72:13	21:20 23:2	19:16 30:22
financial 2:22	formally 50:23	give 19:10 37:25	grave 85:7,17	73:9 89:7,8,21	24:4 36:1	43:4 47:22
35:10.11 40:8	formed 82:18	40:16 43:16	86:2,23 87:9	91:19 92:11	37:13 41:18	54:5 70:3
find 21:24 25:2,9	former 7:23 9:17	55:8 84:13	great 10:13,17	108:22	44:8 45:15,20	108:24
39:12 50:14	forward 61:25	94:7	12:3 15:9	happening 23:22	46:18,22 48:3	imposed 60:19
52:15,16 54:13	forwards 81:12	given 4:7 21:2	24:18 32:24	24:11 25:22	48:25 50:5	impossible 52:8
54:16 56:6	found 7:1 19:10	23:25 26:23	34:24,25 51:18	39:15 52:21	Hipwell's 20:10	52:15,16,22
64:18 109:17	22:15 39:4	41:21 42:17,25	63:8	90:6,10 91:21	44:13 47:20	53:19 60:11,20
finding 8:8 55:11	79:24 80:15,16	42:25 55:13	greater 102:13	91:22 92:19	48:8 49:20	impression
80:12,15,19,22	80:19 104:23	57:22 59:25	grind 36:14	95:25	hire 72:12 79:16	11:15 14:1
80:22	105:22 106:4,5	60:2,4,17 64:3	gross 36:7	happens 17:17	79:19	56:8 100:19
findings 7:12,18	foundation	65:3,9 84:25	ground 18:19	41:12 73:5	hired 105:23	103:23,24
70:15 78:5,11	108:15	86:3 100:20	62:15 82:21	88:12	history 1:21 49:5	imprisonment
78:21 80:8,11	four 21:18 26:11	103:3 106:20	90:9 92:20	happy 12:4	hold 33:12 44:15	66:7
81:2	38:7 39:13	gives 65:5	94:15	17:16 28:21	holdings 46:6	inaccurate 98:1
finger 80:9	45:17 63:18	giving 14:7 45:10	grounds 68:4	35:7,7 109:1	hole 6:25 22:13	inadequate 8:4
fingers 75:11	76:21 104:12	55:15 75:6	group 7:21 18:14	hard 95:19	holiday 38:4	inappropriate
76:13	fourth 7:19	gleaned 77:10	18:16	harmed 104:17	104:9	108:18
finished 41:18	24:25	go 6:17 9:23 15:8	groups 31:4	104:24	holidaymakers	incentive 35:11
fire 24:5	four-year-old	24:23 25:13	Guardian 3:20	haunted 76:6,24	55:7	incident 26:22
fired 36:7	92:5	26:8,14,15	23:12,21 35:19	head 19:12 107:7	honest 70:10	40:24
first 1:4,21,22	fragility 96:13	33:25 47:17	45:21	headed 91:15	73:13 75:16	incline 66:23
2:1 4:1,21 6:17	frankly 34:17	55:17 56:5	Guardian's 21:5	heading 90:14	hope 45:7 50:14	including 4:24
10:18 17:8	52:7 61:5	63:13 78:16	guess 25:18	91:17	81:12 90:20	7:7 27:10
18:10,20 28:15	freelance 3:23	83:15 97:23	guidance 5:25	headline 69:17	horns 53:12	42:20
28:15,23 29:10	frequency 13:25	108:11,21	6:10 guilt 75:23	69:18 104:3	hour 10:3	incomplete 25:16
29:17,20,22 31:8 32:9 38:3	fresh 12:3	109:5,10		headlines 29:16	huge 67:2 92:4 Hughes 20:9,14	
44:24 46:14	Friday 21:5 friend 84:9 98:21	goes 6:9 40:22 87:8 92:5	guilty 3:5 36:11 45:15	29:19,21 70:1 70:6	48:9	inconclusive 70:15 78:23
49:5 50:19	102:8 107:23	100:25	45.15	headquarters	human 79:24	80:2,4
51:10,13 55:5	friends 11:6 13:6	going 1:20 13:13	Н	71:2,3,5,9,24	80:20,21 91:1	incorporate 17:
68:21 69:14	13:24 16:21	14:24 16:13	hack 13:23 14:8	72:12,14 73:14	hundred 38:16	incorrect 72:17
70:12,22 76:12	front 16:5 17:23	17:11,12,13	22:24 24:21	73:24	hunt 103:17	97:21 99:18
79:18,20 80:19	18:4 22:8	18:25 22:7	25:8,15 49:19	health 19:15,21	104:3	103:24
88:7 102:4	24:14,15 29:19	24:1 25:20	hacked 20:12	19:22	hypothesis 71:12	incredible 38:12
103:20	30:12,15,19	26:4 30:16,17	22:10 24:7,12	hear 4:11 14:4	J F • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	independent
firstly 103:12	31:2 32:25	30:19 32:3,4	25:14 42:18,24	16:4 34:11	Ι	20:1
fit 70:1 73:2	50:14 104:3	34:25 37:3	42:24	99:20	idea 19:10 55:16	individual 11:23
five 43:20 59:14	fulfilling 108:3	40:3,4 41:1	hacking 14:1,2	heard 6:23 14:6	91:16	14:22 22:4
flair 12:3	full 1:11 50:12	47:3 50:19	14:16 15:13	14:13 49:6,10	identified 56:16	68:19 80:23
flat 71:13	fully 65:17 87:16	51:16 54:6	16:2,4 17:21	94:17,17 97:16	59:18 60:18	individuals
flavour 79:13	further 32:23	57:3 60:25	17:23,23 18:4	100:8	identify 19:9	57:24 84:19
flawed 53:22	47:17 82:3	63:2 66:16	18:8 21:7,10	hearing 14:17	57:11 103:7,11	industry 22:19
82:17	84:13 85:24	68:21,22 69:10	21:20,24 23:17	108:16	identifying 57:6	22:23 34:20
floor 9:22 10:2	94:13 101:8	70:25 74:25	25:11 26:3,6	heart 9:23 16:18	ifs 39:7	inference 85:13
13:19	109:4	78:22 81:6	26:21 27:7	heavily 27:18	ignore 64:15	86:20 87:7
fluff 95:23		82:2,11,22	49:22	heightened	ignored 71:21	influenced 41:2
fly 75:21	G	83:19 84:1,3	hacks 27:2	75:24	107:25	influential 2:11
focus 30:11 32:8	game 15:22	85:24 87:23,25	half 3:2 10:3	held 8:9 10:19	illegal 15:21	information 6:2
54:11,15 56:8	31:19	90:8,14,25	15:7 26:9	39:2	51:21	6:12 14:3
76:5	gathered 44:18	91:14 93:21	halfway 13:15	help 22:7 25:10	illegality 15:21	21:23 24:18
focusing 45:11	gathering 14:3	94:15 99:23	Hamilton 50:13	43:14,23 66:24	imagine 17:3	25:10,19 27:1
93:24	Gazette 38:25	100:12 101:3	hand 13:20	68:10 74:25	23:23 72:25	36:18 42:19
folder 28:16	general 51:4	102:23,25	53:12,14 75:11	helpful 45:7	immediately	51:19 52:20
fold-out 5:14	71:10 85:23	103:14 106:23	100:16	Herald 18:11,12	25:1 46:24	53:18 54:8,9
followed 3:5	generally 13:4	108:10,11,21	hands-on 9:19	18:17	69:3	54:21 55:1,3,5
following 6:19	15:4 33:8	good 1:3,4,9,10	10:21 30:2	hesitate 61:6	immense 92:15	55:8 56:13,16
forbidden 52:3	gently 45:14	11:6,25 13:9	happen 33:6	hid 71:14 105:17	imparted 74:7	57:12 59:24
force 33:12,21	genuine 18:4	31:7,13,22	54:7 88:12	hide 16:1 35:4	imperative 64:7	60:4,5 61:13 62:5 63:11 14
33:25 82:13 86:12	95:2	32:20,22,24	101:21	high 7:8 10:19	imperatives	62:5 63:11,14
86:12 forced 17:12	Gerry 69:16	33:12,21 34:1 55:16 57:7	happened 8:16	higher 47:12 88:12	66:11	63:17 83:24,2 84:13 15 86:8
forensic 78:5	70:13 98:19 104:9	60:5	15:8 16:22,22	highly 12:1	imply 92:9	84:13,15 86:8 89:17 90:18
	getting 11:15	Goodman 23:19	23:12,18 25:17 30:2 36:17	33:22 34:20	importance 20:23 49:3	94:21 96:13
		Googman 23.17		55.22 54.20	20.23 49:3	77.21 70.13
82:23 forgive 77:8	28:5 32:2	gossip 17:2 22:19	38:24 42:5,5,8	hijacked 100:4	102:13,13	101:13 107:9

109:16	inverted 90:3	jobs 26:17	99:3,13,20	82:11,12,15,22	52:25	lifestyle 3:14
information's	invested 24:6	joined 3:13 4:21	100:7,11	83:17 85:9	legal 17:5,8,19	light 42:12 49:3
61:14,15	investigated	joking 14:13	101:11,15,24	86:12 88:11	27:14,17,25	72:18 98:22
informed 22:10	45:16	Jonsson 49:19	101:11,15,24	90:11,13 91:14	28:3,15 39:7	lightly 35:25
31:24 72:13	investigating	Jonsson's 22:15	102:0,11,21	91:19,20,22,24	57:17 60:12,21	liked 10:10,10
101:12	57:10,14 83:20	journalism 4:22	104:11,14,18	94:24 95:1,4	61:4 62:11,16	13:10 28:7
informing 59:21	94:22 95:17	5:4	104:20,25	96:1,23 97:2	64:8,23,24	likelihood 90:25
infringements	investigation 3:8	journalist 1:23	105:6,19,25	101:11 102:22	65:7 66:19	likes 23:20
13:22	6:20 47:5,10	3:23 9:17	106:7,13,21	105:23 106:11	98:10 107:18	limit 100:12
inherent 82:9	51:22 52:19	10:24 19:21	107:1,4,11,14	knowing 16:23	107:22,25	line 9:2,4 45:4
initially 38:1	53:23 54:7	24:5 25:14	108:1,10	30:3 96:1	108:13	47:8 69:20
46:5	59:1 60:14	26:15 31:23	109:17,24	knowledge 1:17	legalled 17:7	70:12 71:11
injury 43:17	64:12 71:11	32:2 33:10	justify 95:7	8:17 21:14,23	legally 45:4	88:20 95:3,3
injustice 33:14	75:5 82:6,17	34:6,18 35:6	109:10	27:7 46:18	length 46:4	95:20
innocence 75:23	82:21 90:17	35:14 37:16		83:11	lengthy 44:25	lines 55:12 56:10
input 72:9	91:15	50:20 52:17	K	known 5:7 48:24	lesser 46:7	57:1 58:12
inquiry 1:11,13	investigators	53:17 61:3	Kate 69:16 70:13	78:18	102:12	59:14 76:4
44:7,16 47:21	49:12 85:4	70:7,8 74:20	84:25 85:4	knows 33:1	letters 28:5	81:23 88:19
48:2 49:15	87:10,20	88:16 96:22	86:3 98:19		let's 6:15 41:6	95:2
99:22 100:3,4	106:14	journalistic 14:2	104:9 106:15	L	71:19 74:17	linked 79:16
101:23 102:7,9	investment	85:18	106:17	lack 13:16 53:21	86:16 103:22	list 55:4
107:8	36:23 37:25	journalists 4:13	keen 10:7,14,22	54:2,8,15,20	level 11:14 13:4	listening 14:12
inquisitorial	40:16	4:17 6:7 9:24	16:16 28:21	82:20	29:23 60:19	litigation 48:16
48:19,20 99:23	investments 36:5	12:13 13:12,19	keep 31:14 67:5	lacking 49:10	LEVESON 1:3,6	little 4:20 6:15
inserted 72:4	36:19	13:21 14:10,15	key 17:14 31:18	language 75:17	6:4 23:1 37:3,7	7:17 12:6 41:6
Inside 3:14 insider 2:15,17	Investors 40:8 40:11,15	14:23 15:13	77:23	77:11	37:15,18 39:3	live 3:22
37:22		16:1,17 17:15 17:23 19:24	Kiam 28:7	large 31:3 36:23	39:9,20,25	lively 39:14 load 55:15 73:20
insight 58:25	inviting 12:4 involved 12:4	21:15 23:7,9	killed 104:8	66:22	40:20,22 41:4	
insight 38:25 insisted 85:5,15	22:23 27:18	25:7,24 26:5,7	kind 16:9 30:20	larger 36:5,20	41:10 44:4,18 44:22 45:24	loaded 75:18 84:22
insistent 9:10	49:19 66:18	26:23 27:7	43:22 109:16	late 29:14	46:12,23 47:15	local 50:23 55:13
insisting 86:22	73:23 77:3	30:8 33:17,24	knew 16:11 17:21 56:6	launched 31:2 35:21 38:3	47:17 48:17	locals 55:6,25
inspectors 45:17	108:17	34:9 35:4 40:9	60:23,24 63:15	launching 31:8	49:8,23 50:4,8	London 72:19,21
46:16	involvement	50:24 57:6,13	64:7 73:19	61:24	54:12,15,22	73:3 76:19
instances 43:9	11:14,15 16:23	58:5,8,15,17	76:1 78:24	law 2:23 39:20	64:18,24 65:11	long 13:1 14:19
instruct 18:23	29:23 73:25	58:18 59:5,7	79:21 85:13	52:3 58:4	69:4,7 71:20	22:1 41:23
insurer 43:17	in-house 6:1,11	59:10 75:7	86:15 91:15	60:19 62:9	71:25 76:11,17	look 7:19 9:24
intended 98:24	27:17,22 40:6	81:18	93:17 95:2	64:4,19 66:3,9	76:24 83:14	11:9 18:7
interaction 13:4	irresponsible	judge 5:24	knocked 74:8	68:2 93:2	87:4,7 92:25	28:17 47:4
interest 10:8,22	109:15	judge's 7:11	know 9:12,18	94:14 96:24	93:4,7,11,13	62:2 68:19,21
16:16 27:23	isolated 26:22,22	judicial 68:5	10:11,13 11:19	laws 51:20 60:11	93:16,20 94:1	71:19 74:9,17
28:2,21 29:8	isolation 107:13	July 18:11 95:12	11:24 12:24	lawyer 17:17	94:4,7,16,20	81:6 96:1
29:10 51:18	issue 27:13	jury 3:6 39:5	14:11 15:18,23	27:22 40:6	94:23 95:1,6	100:14
53:6,10 63:9	108:10,23	justice 1:3,6 5:22	16:8,10,13,15	88:8	95:22 96:3,11	looked 77:22
interested 10:6,9	109:18	6:4 23:1 37:3,7	19:12,13,16,20	lawyers 6:1,11	96:16 97:4,8	looking 4:20 9:3
17:1 23:21	issues 37:8 45:5	37:15,18 39:3	20:5 22:18,21	62:19 64:20	97:22 98:22	16:11 18:10
interesting 25:20	63:12 65:20	39:9,20,25	22:25 24:20	65:4,16 66:17	99:3,13,20	24:25 27:15
25:23 30:21	76:5,24 77:9	40:20,22 41:4	26:14,18,20,25	66:20 96:9	100:7,11	29:15 34:3
39:14	77:23 84:1	41:10 44:4,18	27:4 28:21,23	layout 28:18	101:11,15,24	35:18 56:24
internal 8:13	item 31:5	44:22,24 45:24	29:13,17,19	lead 44:16	102:6,11,21	69:2,3 79:14
35:19		46:12,23 47:15	30:1,3,5,5,7,24	Leader 11:20	103:7,10,22	looks 7:16 20:1
Internet 38:18	J	47:17 48:17	31:19,19 32:21	leadership 8:22	104:11,14,18	74:2,8,22
102:23	James 1:7,12	49:8,23 50:4,8	32:23 34:22,23	leads 48:21	104:20,25	LORD 1:3,6 6:4
interpreted	January 64:1	51:20 54:12,15	35:3,5 36:18	leaking 68:12,14	105:6,19,25	23:1 37:3,7,15
57:16	98:12	54:22 58:24	37:16,22 38:2	86:8	106:7,13,21	37:18 39:3,9
interrogate 83:5	Jay 46:4 50:7,10	60:10 64:18,24	43:7,8 45:13	leaks 54:9	107:1,4,11,14	39:20,25 40:20
interrupted	50:11 54:22,24	65:11 69:4,7	46:13 47:17,18	learn 10:14	108:1,10	40:22 41:4,10
45:24	65:17 69:6,8,9	71:20,25 76:11	48:9 56:18	learned 98:20	109:17,24	44:4,18,22
interviewed 55:6	72:16 77:8	76:17,24 83:14	61:16,16 62:2	102:8 107:23	liar 49:1	45:24 46:12,23
85:9,14 86:6	84:3 87:4,12	87:4,7 92:25	63:10,13,15	leave 44:7	libel 17:13 27:20	47:15,17 48:17
86:18 87:21	92:23 101:12	93:4,7,11,13	66:12,19 67:19	leaving 73:23	29:2,3	49:8,23 50:4,8
interviewing	103:13 106:9	93:16,20 94:1	67:23 69:2,8	100:24	libellous 17:7	54:12,15,22
87:23	Jay's 76:25	94:4,7,16,20	70:8 73:8,17	led 45:14,19 46:7	licence 85:18 lied 46:17	64:18,24 65:11 69:4 7 71:20
interviews 75:2 75:22 77:19,21	JM2 68:20	94:23 95:1,6 95:22 96:3,11	75:5,13,15	48:3 49:2	lies 95:11	69:4,7 71:20 71:25 76:11,17
introductory	job 11:25 30:8	96:16,24 97:4	77:4,5,16	left 8:17 22:16	life 4:1 41:22,25	76:24 83:14
35:21	35:1 53:1 67:11	97:8,22 98:22	78:24 79:1,5 79:21 80:16	22:21 28:19 29:15 41:24	66:21	87:4,7 92:25
55.21	07.11	11.0,22 90.22	17.21 00:10	27.13 41:24	00.21	01.7,1 72.23
	1	1	•	1	1	1

	•	•	•	•	•	•
93:4,7,11,13	43:15	96:14 99:4	21:19 27:17	26:4 32:12	96:17	officers 57:9,14
93:16,20 94:1	manager 9:4	means 15:23	40:6	57:22	newspaper's	58:3 59:6,12
94:4,7,16,20	managers 8:23	75:16	misconduct 36:8	naming 17:22	18:2	60:6 71:2
94:23 95:1,6	16:2 17:24,25	meant 18:24	misgivings 89:2	26:4	news-gathering	73:18 83:20,21
			0 0			
95:22 96:3,11	18:6 48:6	51:21 54:8,9	89:12	national 26:8	15:25	86:13 88:4
96:16 97:4,8	mark 34:13	64:19	misleading	34:22 50:24,25	Nick 70:21,24	offices 5:19
97:22 98:22	market 38:13,15	measures 42:17	100:19	natural 46:2	72:3,10,21	43:11
99:3,13,20	39:16 43:23	media 3:19 39:10	missing 63:22	91:8 109:6	night 29:14 44:5	official 53:21
100:7,11	Marshall 49:24	51:25 53:22	Mitchell 56:17	naturally 92:14	69:25 70:9	54:25 56:17,20
101:11,15,24	massive 93:8	60:13	67:15,21	nature 90:16	103:1	64:17 71:5
102:6,11,21	96:6	meeting 70:25	mm 4:25 6:22	near 52:8 55:23	nightmare 52:15	73:20 95:13
103:7,10,22	material 22:10	72:15 73:15,22	12:9 21:8	nearer 12:15	ninth 80:9	98:7
104:11,14,18	50:1 90:22,25	members 14:5	60:16 64:2	nearly 13:3	nodding 109:3	officially 93:18
104:20,25	99:15	14:13 26:10	65:21 69:2,13	necessarily 17:3	nonsense 26:20	Oh 107:11
	matter 20:22	memory 14:19	71:17 75:19	43:8	27:5	okay 37:6 55:25
105:6,19,25						
106:7,13,21	21:16 23:11	15:11	76:7 81:3,9,19	necessary 109:5	normally 44:1	67:12 69:11
107:1,4,11,14	28:2 35:16	menacing 34:10	83:2 87:3,14	109:22	51:22 53:1	70:4 73:11
108:1,10	45:13 48:3	34:13,15 35:3	94:3	need 58:13 97:23	62:2 70:21	76:3 84:3
109:17,24	52:10 68:25	35:5	mobile 42:21	108:20 109:13	77:16 88:4	87:19 90:20
Lordship 46:1	69:14 77:21	mentioned 11:11	modern 82:13	negotiate 43:25	note 69:6	92:21
lost 91:2	79:14 85:23	29:9	moment 17:19	neither 36:15	notes 69:9	old 16:21
lot 9:16 11:11	98:10 100:1	mentioning	41:4	42:11	notice 99:25	once 28:6 33:16
16:19 23:9	102:14 107:19	37:24	money 10:10	network 60:13	101:3,9	67:15 75:2
28:5 43:14	matters 45:11	men's 3:13	33:22	networks 53:5	notify 101:23	89:7,8 97:17
53:4 64:20	48:22 88:7	mere 49:7	months 3:2 38:3	66:15	Nott's 48:14	ones 58:2
86:7 87:12	92:13 99:24	merely 64:24	38:16 81:24	never 4:11,19	notwithstanding	ongoing 58:25
lots 83:17,18	100:5	65:2 85:25	moral 42:7	5:16 20:12	44:12	62:20
95:14,15	Max 3:11 23:8	99:8	Morgan 5:13,18	37:10,17 39:23	November 69:9	online 3:17 20:11
loud 86:9 88:2					number 7:17	47:18
	42:14,16,19,23	merging 31:4	7:1,4,22 9:5,10	48:5 70:6,8		
loved 10:18	43:5,7,21	message 14:14	9:14 15:12	80:25	15:10 18:18	open 12:14,15
ludicrous 52:7	maximum 66:6	24:20	16:5,7 24:8,13	new 2:5 104:5	34:1	46:15
53:9	Max's 42:23	messages 14:12	34:7 35:22	news 9:6,8,9,22	numerous 55:2	opened 109:8
Luz 84:18	43:12	18:25 24:9	36:11,16 41:2	18:1 19:20,22		opening 104:4
	McCann 51:7	Messrs 46:22	41:19,22 44:5	19:23,23,25	0	openly 14:6
M	52:25 54:14	met 33:10	45:15,19 46:3	20:4 21:15,15	oath 20:24 49:3	openness 13:25
Madeleine 51:7	55:9 65:1 67:7	method 15:4	46:15 47:7,13	23:18,19 26:16	objecting 101:20	operate 96:15
52:25 54:14,16	67:17 70:13	middle 5:23	47:19,23 48:4	26:21,23 27:2	obligation 86:1	operated 13:21
55:9,20 60:15	84:25 86:3	27:16 85:3	48:6 49:25	50:25 51:5	observation	operation 15:25
67:7 71:13	91:19 98:19	million 38:17	Morgan's 24:22	61:19 62:1,5,7	44:24	opinion 36:10
81:20 91:19	106:17 108:17	mind 82:9 90:20	25:9,14,16	62:13,18,25	Observer 3:20	opportunity
103:18 104:3,5	109:7	92:8	34:11 35:2	63:6 72:3 73:8	obsessed 42:1	46:13 65:6
	McCanns 56:17	minds 33:24	morning 1:3,4,9	88:21,21 89:4		order 14:15
104:8,12,16,24				,	obtain 49:15	
105:24 106:3	56:20 64:3,14	minimise 47:13	1:10 9:20	89:10,16	58:24 59:5,9	27:24 68:7
106:10	64:17 65:8,22	minute 44:11	16:24 45:14	newspaper 4:16	61:3	77:20
Madeleine's	66:1 74:12	99:12	50:2	5:7 7:4,25 8:6	obtained 31:25	organ 41:24
53:23 57:14	77:24 79:8	minutes 25:1	motive 47:11	9:21,23 10:21	obvious 37:5	organisation
78:7,13 79:19	83:5 89:22	41:6 63:18	move 7:15 21:4	11:19,21,24	obviously 18:16	60:13
105:21	105:23	Mirror 2:6 4:1,5	24:2 26:6 27:7	12:4 15:18	18:16 23:17,20	organising 51:24
magazine 2:2 3:9	McCann's 60:15	4:22 5:15,17	27:13 33:16	18:7,13 19:4	28:25 30:21	original 6:20
3:14 5:4	104:5	5:20 6:8 8:12	35:16	19:20,25 20:4	40:1 42:11,23	77:7
magazines 5:11	mean 8:24 11:18	8:20,23 10:16	moved 41:25	20:6 23:5 26:9	43:23 44:25	Orwellian 52:14
main 20:4 36:4	14:18 15:1,14	13:17 14:10,13	51:1	26:9,14,14,22	51:18 52:22	other's 13:7
38:6 59:10	16:9 21:11	16:20 17:24	moving 29:8	28:25 29:1,20	53:4,7 54:16	ought 6:4 39:13
72:6	22:1 24:14,19	20:10,13 21:10	49:25 67:8	29:25 30:1,2	66:16 76:9	outset 82:18
	25:18,22 26:7	21:21 22:9,15	mustn't 76:8	30:16,22 31:1	84:1 106:24	outside 9:6,7
major 41:24	28:22 29:16	22:20,21 23:25	inustii t 70.0	31:6,7 32:6,24		71:9,24 73:21
make-or-break	31:16,17 32:1	22:20,21 23:23	<u> </u>	34:19,22 35:14	109:13	
75:22	,	,		,	occasion 14:4,13	overall 45:2
making 47:24	36:13 43:9	25:12,25 26:10	name 1:11 14:22	36:9,20 39:19	68:3 103:19	79:13
53:11 56:2	52:10,11,11,13	26:12,16,25	19:8,9 33:4	60:13 66:17	October 103:15	overriding 8:25
72:17 75:23	55:21 56:3,9	27:4,4,11,15	50:12 70:21	newspapers	103:24 105:14	oversight 17:20
78:20 87:5	57:25 60:23	28:11,20 31:23	71:20,22 72:1	14:10 17:18,25	offence 45:16	owned 2:19
man 55:22	61:20 67:3,6	36:16,22 40:15	74:3,10 103:19	19:16 26:19,24	offered 25:8,15	
managed 43:2	70:9 74:22,23	41:24 42:1,11	named 48:9	26:24 27:3	office 4:16 6:3,13	P
45:3	75:15 76:1	46:15,24 48:15	64:14 70:22	34:5,6 53:5	9:20,21 12:14	Pacheco 86:6
management 9:2	77:1 78:3 81:3	51:1	74:12	56:19,25 58:11	12:15 42:22	page 5:23 7:18
18:5 19:11	82:11 84:17	Mirror's 13:18	names 14:23	59:23 63:9	43:24	9:3 10:1 13:14
25:8 39:18	87:10 92:18	15:6,10 17:8	17:22 19:8	66:15 77:10,22	officer 108:13	13:15 18:20
20.0 00.10	2		17.22 17.0		511100.15	13.13 10.20
			•	-	-	-

20:8 22:8	60:18 67:9	phones 15:13	87:4,13,15	57:16,17 58:3	52:3 65:23	profession 33:11
24:25 27:15,16	71:16,18 80:23	42:18	89:20 90:7,17		108:17 109:14	33:21,25
			· · ·	58:4,5,11,23		
28:18,18 29:24	86:21 88:15	phoning 23:16	90:18 91:18	59:5,7,10,12	pressure 32:3	professional 7:8
30:12,15,19,22	89:12 90:7,16	phrase 49:17	92:25 93:24	59:23 60:19	34:4,7 53:2,4	programme
31:2 32:8,25	91:16 92:22	physical 13:1	97:5 100:7	61:15,17 62:9	53:13	43:18
34:3 38:9 40:7	95:3	pick 35:23 78:4	101:1,2,19,19	64:3,19 65:10	pressures 33:18	progress 44:15
68:21 69:3	particularly	97:19 101:22	101:25 102:1	65:25 66:3,9	35:10	prominently 5:8
79:8,12 84:9	30:14 32:20	103:13	102:12,13,24	68:2,3 71:11	presumably	propaganda
85:3 103:16	61:23 68:12	picked 100:15	102:25 104:14	74:19 75:21	78:11	67:24
104:3	parties 13:9	picking 58:6	104:15 105:14	76:2 77:10,22	pretty 35:4 37:4	propensity 92:13
pages 29:20	66:18	picture 96:2	105:25 106:2,7	81:17 82:16	43:10 55:16	proper 53:17
38:25 103:5	passed 73:7 75:3	100:24	106:21 108:1,6	83:3,11,16	90:9	properly 52:17
paid 35:13,14	84:15,20	piece 73:11	108:23	84:2 86:5	prevent 42:18	78:22 83:5
68:24	path 91:16,17	75:10 81:22	points 78:4	89:23 90:11	100:20 109:8	proposition
painstaking	pause 41:4	83:1,3,25 84:3	101:22	93:1 98:6	prevented 66:3,9	85:23
81:24	pay 17:13 28:11	84:5 87:13	police 51:20,23	100:15 102:19	previous 75:10	propriety 37:23
paper 12:2 29:15	29:3	96:11	52:19,21 53:1	104:7,16	81:13	protect 32:12
50:23 76:18	PCC 4:7,12,18	pieces 67:9 68:19	53:19,21 54:4	108:12	previously 56:16	33:5 47:12
83:25 93:7	5:1,3,14,16,18	68:22,24	54:25 55:10,12	position 45:1	59:19	protective 42:17
96:5,10	6:18,20 7:12	Piers 7:22 9:18	55:17,17,21	48:13 53:9	priest 84:5,9,10	prove 16:10
papers 30:18	46:5,20,21,25	11:25 16:22	56:8,14 57:3,7	54:17 61:9	84:16,23 85:5	60:11,21 94:12
72:6	47:3	24:8,13 29:13	57:16 58:4,10	63:21,24 64:10	85:9,14,15,25	98:3 99:9
paper's 24:7	PCC's 7:16 47:9	30:1 31:6,11	58:14,18 59:1	82:2,10 108:25	86:18,22 87:1	provide 43:19
35:22	penultimate	35:22,25 36:8	59:12 61:15,17	positions 33:13	87:8,21,23	provided 1:13
paragraph 1:22	74:11	36:23 38:7	62:3 65:5,10	positive 23:3	95:23 106:10	57:11 71:4
5:23 6:24 9:25	people 12:18	Pilditch 50:7,9	65:25 66:8	49:25	106:15,17,18	102:3,7,9
13:13 18:21	14:21 16:19	50:11,13 54:24	67:25 68:3,9	positively 102:16	priests 85:21	103:6
20:7 24:2,25	18:1 20:17	58:19 64:13	68:14 71:1,2,3	possibility 40:6	primarily 27:19	proximity 20:17
32:9 35:9,21	21:13 26:11,17	65:18 72:16	71:4,6,9,11,24	possible 31:15	primary 52:20	PTC-recognised
35:24 48:4	27:3 29:15	75:14 76:11	72:11,13 73:14	38:13 89:20	72:25	5:9
51:15 52:6	30:17 33:12,20	79:10 84:4	73:18,21,23	possibly 99:12	prime 69:16	pub 13:8
53:20 54:24	35:1,6 36:14	85:8 87:16	74:20 75:4	post 19:9	70:14	public 13:25
55:1 56:15,18	38:17 39:25	88:6 92:23	76:2 79:22,23	potential 27:19	principles 37:18	38:19 88:3
56:23 58:22	42:7,21 43:13	97:13,16 99:11	80:7 81:15,17	55:14,24 56:12	print 29:2	96:2 98:11
59:14 60:8	43:23 48:8	102:15 103:18	82:10,13,16	potentially 17:7	printout 21:4	100:19 102:23
62:8 67:12	54:6 55:13,19	105:23 106:9	83:4,11,12,15	100:24	35:19	107:10,12,19
68:1 97:14	56:5 58:1	106:23 108:3	83:16 84:2	pounds 38:16,17	prior 67:13	108:16
102:14 107:15	61:25 68:14	Pilditch's 105:16	85:9,11,14	power 33:13	prison 3:2,16	publication
107:16 109:20	70:22 73:19,22	place 12:19 16:4	86:5,11,17,25	41:17	privacy 13:22	67:14 96:12
paragraphs	84:16 90:4	16:8 39:12	88:1,2,4 90:12	PR 19:1	probably 10:5,12	publications 2:1
21:18 29:22	92:8 93:16	54:4 59:22	91:15,17,23	practice 7:2 8:7	11:7 13:11	40:8
pardon 79:10	97:2 101:6,21	72:15 73:15	93:17 95:4,10	9:14 14:9 16:8	64:11 73:5	publicists 13:24
parentheses	109:8	77:20	95:11,13,19	20:13 22:2	87:22 97:4,10	publicity 43:11
80:13	people's 33:24	plain 106:19	96:19,20 97:16	37:9 40:23	100:12	publicly 47:7
parents 52:25	perfectly 15:5	plan 12:14,15	97:17 98:1,2,3	69:21 72:23	problem 41:17	48:24 61:2
71:14 81:21	106:18	plausibility 82:9	98:7 99:1,8,15	88:11 100:13	43:14 51:19	publish 88:15
91:2 104:5	period 95:14	82:13	99:16 100:15	101:7	65:22 86:7	109:16
105:17	Periodicals 5:5	play 15:23 65:20	102:17,19	practices 109:14	problems 41:16	published 18:11
parishioners	permit 100:4	played 71:23	102:17,19	practise 100:25	60:18 61:21	21:25 29:12
84:17	101:6	played 71.23 plc 7:3,22	104:16,21,22	Praia 84:18	63:2 101:5	90:22 91:1
part 13:1 14:19	persist 62:23	pleaded 3:5	104:10,21,22	preceding 59:15	procedure 44:3	95:17 102:17
15:24 18:16	personal 39:4	please 1:11,21	105:5,11,12,13	precise 2:21	72:16 97:6	publishing 1:25
20:5 22:19	42:6 43:17	4:20 6:17 7:15	105:18,21,22	44:19	procedures 8:13	3:13,17 17:6
26:25 42:9	82:8 90:24	21:4 24:2,23	106:3,4,16,19	precisely 64:19	proceed 45:13	pull 31:20
47:20 49:22	personality	41:12 50:11	107:5,8,13,18	67:6 78:20	49:16	pulling 34:23
67:24 68:20	11:22	51:13 54:24	107.5,8,15,18	87:13	proceedings 25:3	72:7
72:20 73:7,11	personally 42:19	55:4 56:22	political 19:13	premise 95:19	25:6 45:18	punch 3:9 6:25
77:17 82:24	perspective	68:19 84:4	ponder 82:8	107:24 108:9	65:11 108:13	22:13
85:2,19	91:12,12,13	103:8	popular 2:11	prepare 101:20	process 58:21	purchase 7:21,23
participant	phase 56:7	pleased 8:12	popularise 2:9	present 63:15	63:12 77:18	7:25 8:1
99:25 101:4	phone 16:2,4	pm 109:25 110:1	Portugal 51:8	64:16	100:6	purchasing 7:2
participants	17:21 18:8	point 7:18 9:25	64:21 65:4,16	presented 62:17	processes 77:3	purely 94:16
45:12 48:21	22:17,24 23:17	48:14,15,17,19	70:24 80:1	77:13	produce 39:14	purpose 99:22
100:17 101:16	24:22 25:11,15	57:1 59:16	81:25 96:15,24	presenter's	53:2 81:25	purposes 70:3
	26:6,21 27:1	64:9 65:17	98:10 107:18	22:17	produced 11:21	86:16
narticular 6.19	20.0.21 2/.1	01.7 05.17	20.10 107.10			
particular 6:19 30:11 38:8	,	78:20 79:15	Portuguese 52:3	press 7:16 37.12	12:3 38:11	pursue 48:22
30:11 38:8	42:21,24,24	78:20 79:15 81:4.16 82:6.7	Portuguese 52:3 56:19.25 57:12	press 7:16 37:12 38:25 51:25	12:3 38:11 productive 44:14	pursue 48:22 pursuing 55:12
-	,	78:20 79:15 81:4,16 82:6,7	Portuguese 52:3 56:19,25 57:12	press 7:16 37:12 38:25 51:25	12:3 38:11 productive 44:14	pursue 48:22 pursuing 55:12

Merrill Legal Solutions (+44) 207 404 1400

39:12 40:7	90:17	regular 4:8 58:2 regularly 34:8	100:16 104:6	9:4 12:23	saw 11:12 14:20	69:12 70:12,20
41:1 45:18	reaction 63:6	regulated 37:25	reporter 18:24	18:12 20:14	15:6 31:6	73:2 74:11
54:4 58:17	read 1:19 6:4	40:16	20:9,15 33:4	28:1,6 30:13	37:10,17 65:17	78:5 81:1
61:9 65:6 67:1	13:13 25:1	rehearsed 7:13	51:5 72:7 73:9	32:11 33:4	73:18,18,18,22	94:19 95:18
77:23 79:12	40:11,17 46:14	reinforce 102:16	96:22	39:2 40:22,25	73:25 94:16	96:16 102:10
81:17 88:8,9 88:16 97:15	51:16 59:15 71:25 76:17	103:2 reinforces 87:13	reporters 14:7 32:11 33:9	51:5,6 52:5,18 53:16 55:18,20	102:4 saying 27:6 28:6	102:24 103:22 seeing 15:1 17:5
99:17 100:2	87:12 102:25	reinstate 38:10	57:7 63:13	55:21 56:7	32:10 37:15	38:14 74:6
103:24 105:2	reading 77:10	reinvestigate	72:5,8	57:19 58:3,8	50:1 53:8 56:3	87:17
107:22 109:3	reads 6:25 8:11	37:4 47:4	reporting 66:16	59:2,4 65:1	56:24 58:19	seeking 44:7
109:21	18:21 20:8	relate 106:11	67:10 81:15	66:2,6 67:2	60:17,22 61:11	71:12 107:23
putting 55:22	22:13	related 49:22	90:7 91:21	68:15,17,21	62:3 66:14	109:9
56:11 77:8	real 10:20 33:17	relates 46:25	92:19 98:1,2	69:23 71:15	67:25 72:18	seeks 103:2
90:21 92:8	38:19	106:8 relation 7:7,19	100:12	72:19 74:14	74:2,16 76:13	seen 5:16 15:20
104:21 105:4	reality 35:25 46:19	8:9 29:11	reports 18:7 60:10,23 90:11	78:14 81:14 82:4 83:6 84:9	76:21 77:1 79:22,23 83:22	42:12 73:6 95:7 106:24,25
Q	really 16:22	48:14 49:18	90:16 98:11	84:20,23 85:3	85:11 86:5	106:25 109:20
question 17:8,19	31:16 39:14,17	51:7 52:18	102:17 107:19	88:17,22 92:12	87:20,25 90:12	sell 30:16 34:5
17:21 22:6	41:25 65:21	53:3 67:19	representation	93:15 99:20	90:13 91:20	send 28:13,15
34:13 40:3	70:20 75:15	80:9 89:12,21	19:3 64:25	101:24 102:11	92:6 96:19,19	34:8
41:1 45:2	83:12 86:9	99:6,6 105:15	65:8	103:24 104:11	96:20,22 97:3	senior 8:23,25
58:17 62:23	88:5 91:14 97:12	107:3 108:18 108:22	request 6:20 required 43:10	104:14 105:6	97:22,24 99:16 99:17 102:18	15:6,17 17:25
65:18 76:25	97:12 reason 68:15	relations 9:2	101:15	105:20 106:7 106:21 107:4	says 7:20 21:6,18	18:1,6 21:16 48:6 57:9,14
77:20 79:12 90:20 92:1	95:20 101:20	13:25	requirement	108:6 109:24	24:3 35:24	58:3 59:6,11
99:3 102:15	108:24	relationship 11:5	109:10	rightly 81:22	48:4 69:14	60:6 68:16
103:3 104:25	reasonably 81:4	13:10	requirements	rigorously 8:6	76:12 87:10	71:1 83:21
106:23 109:17	reasoning 47:1	relatively 98:17	37:22	rise 94:7	98:5,8 99:21	94:22
questions 1:8,20	reasons 37:4	release 3:16 7:16	reserve 32:11	risen 48:12	107:16	sense 33:11 91:3
14:24 17:14	recall 5:20 23:15	98:9 107:17	33:4	risk 27:25 93:7	scene 73:25	senses 80:18
30:7 31:21	37:11 49:17 76:15 82:5	released 94:25 95:13 98:7	resort 55:7,10	96:5,9 100:24 rivals 63:11	scenes 83:19 84:1 86:14	sent 27:24 28:22 72:24 77:7
44:2 45:4 47:25 50:10	recognise 4:13	relevance 6:23	respect 4:4 47:6 108:7	role 61:3 71:7,23	scoop 14:16	sentence 3:3 6:5
58:14 65:6,9	49:11	relevance 0.25 relevant 44:23	respectfully	94:16	35:12	32:9 52:6
97:7,13 98:18	recognised 5:5	45:5 47:2 55:9	100:3	roles 26:18	scoops 34:5	59:15 66:7
100:1 101:2,4	73:19	101:9	response 40:13	round 54:11	scraps 58:7	74:11 76:3,12
101:8 102:20	recommendati	relied 102:16	103:3	55:10 61:12	screen 9:25 11:1	85:8 87:7
quickly 99:19	11:13	religious 86:1	responsibility	route 90:14	11:10,13,14	107:14,15
quietly 38:5	reconsider 47:4 record 68:6,11	remarkable 49:1 remarks 5:22	8:5 36:16 42:9 42:10	108:12 routine 87:23	29:16 scrutinised 29:6	sentenced 3:2 sentencing 5:22
quite 2:14 11:6 23:1 26:15	68:17 98:11	remember 5:3	responsible 9:12	royal 19:14	scrutinising 29:9	sentiment 62:13
28:5 34:10,16	99:8 107:19	12:18 22:1,2,3	69:17.22	Rule 44:7	29:11	September 64:1
48:2 52:7	108:14 109:4	22:22 23:15	103:20 109:15	ruling 6:18,19	scrutiny 27:14	64:4 74:12
67:23 75:24	recorded 46:21	24:11 25:18,21	restrictions	7:16 44:9	30:14 64:8	89:23 98:12
81:7 97:22	recruited 2:4	25:22 70:23	60:19 62:9	46:10,21	Search 8:1	series 107:9
107:14	reduce 94:16	72:20 76:22	result 24:17	rumour 23:3	second 6:24	serious 15:2
Quolian 1:12	Reed 1:25 4:24 refer 23:23 47:23	77:1 84:6 92:2 reminding 49:21	71:13 75:24 results 79:5 80:2	50:2 run 9:21 31:5,11	18:21 48:4 80:21,25	service 59:12 Services 2:22
quotations 18:18 quoted 18:8	68:22 75:9	reminding 49:21 remit 9:9	resume 109:25	32:14,23,23,25	secondly 45:2	set 45:3
quoted 18:8 quoting 56:19	reference 4:11	remove 65:2	retraction 17:13	38:12	88:14	seven 4:22
Jacome 20.17	45:20 78:11	reopen 47:9	29:2	running 37:20	secrecy 51:20	severe 2:14
R	referred 46:9	68:25	return 17:19	37:20 54:22	60:10 68:5	share 6:2,12 7:23
raise 40:2,5,19	referring 19:11	reopened 6:21	returned 45:21	runs 66:23	96:24	35:16 37:1
100:1	22:14 61:5	69:1	Returning 17:20	100:23	secret 87:9	38:6 42:8
raised 8:7 27:13	77:6 107:5	repeat 92:2,3	reveal 17:15	<u> </u>	secrets 31:16	62:25 shared 28:16
48:5 97:13	refers 5:13 97:15 98:8 105:18	repeated 8:14 13:22	31:14 32:3,4,4 32:5,6	sack 34:17	85:6,16 86:2 86:23	shared 28:16 62:13 89:4
100:8 102:14	106:14	repeating 54:18	revealed 97:17	sack 34:17 sacking 21:21	section 2:22,23	shares 2:19 7:2
105:15 ran 31:13	reflect 98:24	repeats 21:9	98:25,25	Safeway 31:4	19:13,25 20:4	7:21 8:1 24:6
rarely 30:25	reflected 39:15	replaced 34:21	revealing 47:12	sat 10:7 13:18	see 5:15 7:17 8:8	36:25 37:20,23
	refused 68:3	70:25	revised 8:13	20:17 21:12,13	8:22 9:14	40:9
31:1						
•	refusing 68:9,11	report 15:12	revisit 39:4	45:22	13:20 16:4	share-tipping
31:1		report 15:12 19:3 23:11 59:6,11	revisit 39:4 rewarding 33:23 rewriting 29:19	45:22 satisfactory 60:11,21	13:20 16:4 18:4,5 21:18 29:10,14,21	share-tipping 38:2 shavers 28:8

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$							
97.97.11,11.2 95.117.52.1 66316.94:10 stated 105.9 71.18,23.25 106.5 system 13.5 10021 101:12 12.7.12.29:18 soculta/state soculta/state 73.7.10.74:18 104.23 58.29.91:14 104.23 58.29.91:14 104.23 58.29.91:15 73.7.10.74:11.8 104.23 58.29.91:15 subtleba 100.59 subtleba 100.59 <td>Sherborne 18.13</td> <td>sit 12.10 16.24</td> <td>57.21 25 58.11</td> <td>state 52.7 91.5</td> <td>70.20 71.7 16</td> <td>84.23 105.4</td> <td>sympathy 100.6</td>	Sherborne 18.13	sit 12.10 16.24	57.21 25 58.11	state 52.7 91.5	70.20 71.7 16	84.23 105.4	sympathy 100.6
98:59:11,14 stitung 91:6 10.3 107.9 106.6 72:3,4,9,10.24 suggests 87:8 16:32 16:33 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:32 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33 16:33							
1002.1 1012.4 102.7.12 27.12 27.10 77.10							
10124 102:10 stratuble 1005 system 32 socalled 29:19 1:19.22 5:13 74:15 76:21 snituble 1005 103:12,21 66:19 19:2 space 78.8,13 24:23 25:13 77:13,15 84:2 Smit 14:11,16 T 103:2,01.2 65:8 51:9,01.02 space 78.8,13 24:23 25:13 77:13,15 84:2 Smit 14:11,16 T 105:20 106:2,3 51:9,01.02 space 81:8 51:13 36:24 47:19 99:12,33 45:5 26:10,13,16 50:15 66 106:14 107:23 skin 35:5 74:20 77:12 51:16 61:2 stratiger 51:24 stabid 21: stabid 22:							
102:12:1 6:16:10:38 space 70:2 5:24:94:13:15 77:24:11.13 smite 27:20 T 103:20:12 space 70:32							
103.2,9,12 66:19:12 spare 78.8,13 24:23 25:13 77:13,15 84:22 Sun 14:11.16 T. 104:12,15,71 six 32:23 36:12 77:16 30:10 89:12,14-22,24 18:12,17 26:1 18:10 21 105:20 106:23 six 35:5 74:20 77:12 Six 16:6 12: six 13:5 74:13 77:14 18:10 21 106:14 107:23 skin 35: 74:20 77:12 Six 16:6 12: six 13:6 3:7 79:10 109:19 skin 35: 74:20 77:12 Six 16:6 12: six 13:8 4:7 79:10 109:19 skin 45: special 72:23 97:14 98:51.4 strategis 51:4 stubiois 2: 39:10:822 short 78:41:8 108:22 special 72:27:76 103:522 size 33:13:35 superior 5:25 six 18:19:6 showbics 2: socutal 2:19 special 4:49 statements 9:16 size 32:19 31:4 92:10:8:2 showbics 2: socutal 3:13 special 72:2 state 19:6 superiors 2:12 superiors 2:12:9 superiors 2:12:9 superiors 2:12:9 superiors 2:12:9 superiors 2:12:8 superiors 2:12:8 superiors							systems 13:24
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	102:12,21	62:16,21 63:8	space 70:2	5:24 9:4 13:15	77:2,4,11,13	suits 27:20	
104.2 105.37 29:20:43:20 s668 32.8 34.2 89:12.14.22.24 18:12.72.61 18:10 105:20 106.28 51:9.10:2 speaking 55:13 36:44:71.9 90:12.3 942 26:10.13.16 51:8 46 106:14 107:23 skin 35: 74:20.77.12 51:16 61:2 straight 71:3 Sunday 21:319 70:10 109:19 slicker 24:4 speaks 74:20 85:20.93:12 straight 71:3 34:6 23:92:66 short 78:41:8 108:22 special 27:23 97:14 98:51:44 stratege 51:43 superiors 5:25 superiors 5:25 superiors 5:25 stabiolis 21: 61:03:81:2 92:01:07 100:4 2:22 store 73:31 specific 40:23 100:19 strength 32:19 stabiolis 21: 92:01:07 10:4:0 societ 33:13 specific 47:25 station 67:32 supperinsel.44:11 45: 92:01:07 12:2:6:10 sonebody 70:22 speak 42:25 station 67:32 supperinsel.44:11 45: 94:13:90:44:11 45: 35:0:10 station 64:26 strang 32:11 strictly 67:22 supperinsel.44:11 45: 94:1	103:2,9,12	66:1 91:2	spare 78:8,13	24:23 25:13	77:13,15 84:22	Sun 14:11,16	T
104.2 105.37 29:20.43:20 66:8 32:8 34:2 89:12,14.22,24 18:10.17,26:1 18:10 27: 105:20 106:23 situ 30:7 56:5 66:4 48:5 50:15.16 90:1,3 94:5 26:10.13,16 50:15 86: 106:11 107:23 situ 30:7 75:65 66:4 48:5 50:15.16 97:10 25:10 8:10:37 27:10 21:10 3:18 26:10.73:7.3 42:10 3:10:35 109:19 sitker 24:4 special 27:23 97:14 98:5.14 strateger 51:43 34:6 32:9 26:6 short 78:41:8 108:12 special 27:23 97:14 98:5.14 strateger 51:43 superiors 5:25 stabiold 21: showt 105:22 92:25 108:2 specifics 40:23 100:19 strength 32:19 31:4 92:10:07 10:4:6 12:2 stowbali 66:23 specifics 40:23 100:19 strength 32:19 31:4 92:10:07 10:4:6 12:2 stowbali 66:23 specifics 40:23 stride 17:32 supervising 11:1 32:0:6:4 92:10:11:0:6:10:0:5 strength 32:19 31:1:4:1:1:9:5 10:4:12:0:10 somobali 66:23 specifics 40:23 streng	104:1,12,15,19	six 3:2 12:24	speak 52:3 62:1	27:16 30:10	85:2 88:15	16:18,21 18:11	tab 6:17 7:15
105.20 106:14 107.2 sixth 207 56:56:46 48:55:50:15.6 27:10.43:18 27:10.43:18 109:19 sikth 27 55:66:44 84:17 62:88:19 72:11 26:17:73:34 79:10 shops 30:17 Sikther 24:4 84:17 62:88:19 72:11 26:17:73:43 79:10 shops 30:17 Sikther 24:4 84:17 62:88:19 72:11 26:17:73:43 79:10 shop 50:17:8 sittley:15:12 specific 45:66 100:3:52:2 52:25:14 superoin 51:21 <	104:22 105:3,7	29:20 43:20	66:8	32:8 34:2	89:12,14,22,24	18:12,17 26:1	18:10 21:4
10614107:23 sixth 20:7 56:5 66:4 48:5 50:15.16 94:18 96:5 27:10 43:18 50:15 68: 1097:19 sikker 24:4 skat 35: 74:20 77:12 51:16 61:2 strain 84:24 34:6 23:9 2:6 short 78:41:8 108:22 special 27:23 97:14 98:51:4 strategis 54:3 superior 5:25 superior 5:21 superior 5:25		51:9.10.12	speaking 55:13	36:24 47:19			
		, ,					
109:19 sileker 244 84:17 62.8 S2:09 72.11 26.27:11 27.27:14 127:27:34 110:10:12 short 78:41:8 108:22 special 27:23 97:14 98:51.4 strategy 51:24 superiors 52:1 131:35:4 short 19:81:7 sight 15:19.20 28:2 100:35:10:61.8 strategy 51:24 superiors 52:2 52:25:40:10 60:39:19 28:64:33 10:63 smears 10:45:7 76:16:30:23 specifies 40:23 100:19 street 23:14 superrvisin 8:49 42:81:01 10:64:07:25 sovebuilt 9:52 specifies 40:23 100:16:10:6 striend 57:21 strong 33:11 superrvisin 8:49 42:81:01 12:0:11,72:5 solicitors 28:5 specifies 40:23 strong 33:11 strong 33:11 supplemental 42:81:01 14:52:3:15:14 somewhat 75:18 splashing 31:9 strong 33:11 strong 33:12 supplemental 42:11:9:1 42:81:01 15:13:16:1,17 72:6 9:62:1 solicitors 28:5 splashing 31:9 strong 33:1 superiors 10:1:1 10:1:10:10:1:10:1:10:1:10:1:10:1:10:1:							
shops 30:17 Sitckers 2:8 8:4 speaks 7:4:20 85:20 9:12 strategies 4:3:4 34:6 23:9 2:06 short 78:41k 108:22 specific 1:27:3 97:14 98:51.4 superior 15:12 31:1 35:4 short 79:81/7 sightly 15:19:20 22:21 100:18:32 strategies 4:32.4 superior 15:12 31:1 35:4 10:6:3 smears 10:45 76:15:22 7:76 100:51 10:16:18 strength 3:2:19 str						•	
short 78 41:8 108:22 special 27:23 97:14 98:5,14 strategy 51:24 superiors 15:12 31:1 35:4 short 195:22 92:25 108:2 specific 45:6 100:3 51:06:18 strategy 51:26:27:5 strategy 51:26:18 superiors 5:27 52:25:25:25:25:25:25:25:25:25:25:25:25:2						,	
short (98:17) slighty 15:19;20 28:2 100:18;22 strategy 51:24 spreariors 52:5 tabliels 21:10 106:3 smears 104:5 76:15;22:77:6 103:35:10:18 street 23:14 strong 32:19 31:4 92:20:10:7 104:64 12:22 snowy 66:23 speculate 44:9 statements 95:16 strong 33:11 supervising 11:1 28:20:36:1 showhy 51:17 25:65:26:10 status 64:36:62 strong 33:11 supervising 11:1 28:20:36:1 12:6:11,17:25 solicitors 28:5 speel 10:34:1:2 status 64:36:62 strong 33:11 supervising 44:9 42:8:10.1 13:13:16:11,17:25 somehody 70:22 splash 22:8 step 1:10:10:17 sturg 81:75:8 sturg 81:77:8 supporter 71:12 take 34:6 22:35:25:27:12 socu 41:75:8 splash 22:8 stock 38:13 sturg 81:36:10:82:3 sturg 81:36:10:82:3 sturg 81:36:10:82:3 sturg 81:36:10:82:3			-				
show 105:22 52:25 108:2 specific 45:6 102:35,22 52:25 4:10 51:03:19 26:68:43:2 106:3 smears 104:5 76:22 specifics 40:23 109:19 street 23:14 supermixed tabe 109:10 street 23:14 supermixed tabe 109:19 street 23:11 supermixed tabe 109:19 street 23:11 supermixed tabe 112:2 supermixed tabe 111:12 supermixed tabe 111:12 supermixed tabe 111:12 supermixed tabe 111:12 111:12 111:11 111:10:16:10 111:11 111:10:16:10 111:11:16:16:17 111:11:16:16:17:16:17:1							
showbits $9:16,17$ snowball $66:23$ specifies $40:23$ $100:19$ strength $32:19$ $31:4$ 92010.7 $10:46,12:22$ snow foc:23specch $103:91.11$ $101:6107.6$ strident $67:23$ supervising $11:1$ $28:20.36$ $showbusiness$ society $33:12$ specch $103:91.11$ states $64:366.2$ strong $33:11$ strong $33:11$ supervision 84.9 $42:11.45$ $14:523:151,81:9$ solicitors $28:5$ speel $96:18$ state $64:366.2$ strong $33:10$ strong $33:10$ support $11:24$ $85:6,168$ $14:523:151,81:9$ somewhar $7:18$ speel $96:18$ $32:31:7$ strong $33:10$ strikk $31:7$ $98:18$ $62:11.77$ $15:13.161:17$ $7:26:96:21$ $30:11.15,19,21$ $104:22$ struth $56:75:8$ $90:15:11.106:5$ $101:11.106:5$ $19:18,19,20$ son onewhar $7:18$ spackesharstock $38:13$ stubelitins $70:1$ $81:4.96:0$ $22:23:25:1,71:2$ $62:24.41:3$ Sot:18,20.67:16 $39:15$ subelitins $70:1$ states $34:21$ $22:23:25:1,71:2$ $62:24.41:3$ Sot:18,20.67:16 $30:16$ subelitins $70:1$ suppose $63:42$ $23:24:12:5$ $17:12:23:27$ $76:17:10$ $72:24$ stoff $3:17:5$ $30:16:10:10:23$ $30:16:17:16:3:16:10:17:16:3:16:11:16:17:16:3:16:11:16:17:16:3:16:11:16:12:2330:16:11:16:11:16:11:16:11:16:11:11:16:11:11$							
104:64 101:6 101:7 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>take 1:19 6:6,24</td></t<>							take 1:19 6:6,24
	showbiz 9:16,17	snowball 66:23	specifics 40:23	109:19	strength 32:19		9:20 10:7 16:1
	,	snowy 66:23	speculate 44:9	statements 95:16	strictly 67:18	supervising 11:1	28:20 36:10
showbusiness society 33:12 specches 47:25 status 64:3 66:2 strong 33:11 supplemental 44:1 45:2 12:6,111.75 sole 7:33 spend 10:31:12 strus 64:3 66:2 strong 37:11 support 21:24 85:61:6 14:5,23 15:10 somehody 70:22 splash 22:8 strug 87:05:2 strug 87:75:8 105:11 10:65 101:110 16:18,23 17:12 someore's 74:8 30:25 31:7 stickig 49,18 strug 87:75:8 105:11 10:65 101:110 18:2,23 19:10 someore's 74:8 30:25 31:7 stickig 49,18 strug 87:75:8 support 71:12 taken 75:6 20:9,14 21:1 strus 64:30 stickig 49,18 stubiditor 69:22 support 71:12 takea 34:2 25:25 26:7,13 65:19 06:2 spokespoenle stopped 11:8 subeditor 69:24 supposed 58:4 32:32 47:1 26:14 32:2 76:11 79:10 65:22 stopped 11:8 subeditor 69:24 supposed 58:4 32:24 71: 26:15 43:22 76:11 79:10 sport 3:17 10:9 15:10 supposed 58:4 32:24 71: supposed 58:4 32:24 71:	14:21 26:10	socialise 13:8	speech 103:9,11	101:6 107:6	strident 67:23		42:8,10,17
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	showbusiness	society 33:12		station 73:21	strong 33:11		44:11 45:14
13:5.18.19 14:5.23solicitors 28:5 (spear 10:34)spear 10:13 (spear 10:17)11:22 (step 16:110:17)support 21:24 (step 16:110:17)85:6.16 8 (spear 10:17)14:5.2315:1316:1.17 (spear 10:17)72:6 96:21 (spear 10:17)30:11,15,19,21 (spear 10:17)104:2 (step 16:110:17)95:22 (spear 10:17)47:11 99:16 (spear 10:17)103:11 106:5 (spear 10:17)114:11 106:5 (spear 10:	12:6,11,17.25	•					62:11 77:20
							85:6,16 86:23
			-				
					00 0		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
19:8,19.20 soon 102:25 spoke 64:20 stinging 35:21 style 16:17:16 supporter 10:17 takes 34:21 20:9,14:21:11 sorry 38:24:59:8 spokesman stock 38:13 subediting 77:18 supporter 10:17 takes 34:21 22:3:25:7,12 65:24:64:13 56:18,20:67:16 39:15 subeditor 69:22 67:2 talented 42 25:25:25:26:7,13 65:19:69:2 stock 38:18 69:24 suppose 58:4 23:24:71 26:15:32:27 76:11 79:10 65:22 stood 71:9:73:21 subeditors 70:1 suppose 58:4 23:24:71 sight 102:18 20:5 29:10,13 sports 3:17 10:9:15:10 23:20:68:4 22:11:23:5 17:24:38:8 significant 29:3 58:9:63:12.16 staff 75: 29:16:30:5,12 submission 74:17 78:2 88:32:4 significant 29:3 58:9:63:12.16 stage 55:2:2:55: 56:5:61:7 98:20 85:8:19 87:16 10:71:3 significant 29:2 87:12 46:2:2:63:22 67:19:21:30:2 98:10 71:78:2 89:20:25 108:2 71:5:6.8:82:23 88:29:99:2	,						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
26:15 43:22 76:11 79:10 65:22 stood 71:9 73:21 subleatiors 70:1 suppositions 93:18 102 showed 14:7 87:6 89:9 spokesperson stopped 11:18 subleating 62:4 9:1 surp c6:16 7:14 talken 11:4 sight 102:18 20:5 29:10,13 sports 3:17 10:9 15:10 23:20 68:4 22:11 23:5 17:223 18: sight 102:18 20:5 29:10,13 sporte 3:17 10:9 15:10 23:20 68:4 22:11 23:5 17:23 18: significant 29:3 58:9 63:12,16 stage 52:15 22:4 29:9,11 subjected 47:8 53:16 65:17 63:24 8:11 10: significantly 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:25 34:19 53:2 submit 100:3 92:19 3:4 37:11 significantly 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:25 34:19 53:2 submit 100:3 92:19 3:4 37:11 significantly 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:25 34:19 52:2 submit 100:3 92:19 3:4 37:11 significantly 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:25 34:19 52:1 submit 100:3 92:19 3:4 37:11 significantly <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>talk 18:20 21:12</td></th<>							talk 18:20 21:12
showed 14:7 87:6 89:9 spokesperson stopped 11:18 subheading 6:24 77:24 talked 18:4 sight 102:18 20:5 29:10.13 sports 3:17 10:9 15:10 23:20 68:4 22:11 23:5 17:23 18: sight 102:18 50:5 29:10.13 sports 3:17 10:9 15:10 23:20 68:4 22:11 23:5 17:23 18: sight 102:18 56:12,5 57:1 sported 38:8 17:12,4 21:19 77:21 43:11 52:23 57:24 58: significant 29:3 58:9 63:12,16 staff 75 29:16 30:5,12 submissions 74:17 78:2 tap 38:20 108:2 71:5,6,8 82:23 88:25 99:23 55:2 56:5 61:7 98:20 58:8,19 87:16 taught 51:1,3 significantly 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:22 61:2 67:12,16 subsequent 109:1 tag 38:20 signs 8:22 84:24 86:11,12 100:6 61:8 64:7 submit 100:3 92:1 93:4 37:11 simand 42:20 sorted 41:16 stand 35:7 50:16 89:3 92:9,17 ds:24 47:24 12:11,17 simand 20:7 sorted 41:16							23:24 71:8
side 108:23sort 9:12.25 18:4 $64:1^7$ stories 4:10 10:4subject 8:24 9:1sure 6:16 7:14talking 11:1sightings 56:1251:19 53:710:9 15:103:20 68:422:11 23:517:23 18:signifigs 56:1251:19 53:7square 32:1522:4 29:9,11subject 47:853:16 65:1763:24 82:significant 29:358:9 63:12,16stage 5:2 23:7,1730:12,23 31:110:1673:13 74:6,14107:13significantly66:19 67:346:2 80:2534:19 53:2submission69:20,25 70:1086:13 10'.13significantly66:19 67:346:2 80:2534:19 53:2submissions74:17 78:2tag 38:20108:271:5,6,8 82:2388:25 99:2355:2 56:5 61:798:2085:8,19 87:16taught 51:1,3similar 63:11,1286:13 88:3,4stage 54:20 56:466:12 67:12,16subsequent109:1team 10:41106:290:8,18 94:1261:23 63:2267:19,21 70:298:10 107:18surprisingly13:5,18simple 30:7sorted 41:16stand 35:7 50:1689:3 92:9,1768:2447:2414:13 25:simply 49:2195:1585:6,16,25109:2110:2:239:6team's 29:873:7 79:18sound 53:1186:12 93:5,11story 10:11:11subte 64:22suspect 5:65:1924:2199:1978:2010:17 102:1917:16 21:25successful 22:1265:6 6:24technique 199:1933:5,54:25standard 60:1222:21,24,25successful 22:1269:614:721	26:15 43:22	76:11 79:10		stood 71:9 73:21		supposition	93:18 102:8
	showed 14:7	87:6 89:9	spokesperson	stopped 11:18	subheading 6:24	77:24	talked 18:4
	side 108:23	sort 9:12,25 18:4	64:17	stories 4:10 10:4	subject 8:24 9:1	sure 6:16 7:14	talking 11:17
sightings 56:12 51:19 53:7 spotted 38:8 17:1,2,4 21:19 77:21 43:11 52:23 57:24 58: signed 50:15 56:1,25 57:1 square 32:15 22:4 29:9,11 subjected 47:8 53:16 65:17 63:24 82: significant 29:3 58:9 63:12.16 staft 75 29:16 30:5.12 submission 69:20,25 70:10 86:13 107 significanty 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:25 34:19 53:2 submissions 74:17 78:2 tag 83:20 108:2 71:5,6,8 82:23 88:25 99:23 55:2 56:56 17 98:20 85:8,19 87:16 taught 51:1,3 similar 63:11,12 86:13 88:3,4 stages 54:20 36:42 67:12,16 subsequent 100:1 taught 51:1,4 Similar 44:3 96:8 stamped 29:23 72:5 88:25 substatial surprised 102:6 12:11,17 Similar 44:16 stand 35:7 50:16 89:3 92:9,17 68:24 47:24 14:13 25: simply 91:1 95:15 85:6,16,25 100:21 10:2 39:6 20:21 10:2 39:6 simply 92:1 95:15	sight 102:18	20:5 29:10,13	sports 3:17	10:9 15:10	23:20 68:4	22:11 23:5	17:23 18:19,22
signed 50:15 56:1,25 57:1 square 32:15 22:4 29:9,11 subjected 47:8 53:16 65:17 63:24 82: significant 29:3 58:9 63:12,16 staff 7:5 29:16 30:5,12 submission 69:20,25 70:10 88:13 107 significantly 66:19 67:3 46:2 80:25 34:19 53:2 submissions 74:17 78:2 tap 38:20 108:2 71:5,68 82:23 88:25 99:23 55:2 56:5 61:7 98:20 85:8,19 87:16 tag 38:20 similar 63:11,12 80:13 88:3.4 stages 54:20 56:4 66:12 67:12,16 subsequent 109:1 team 10:4 1 tam 35:1,81 simon 42:20 sorte 41:16 stam 35:7 50:16 89:3 92:9,17 68:24 47:24 14:13 25: simpl 30:7 sort 39:7 93:14 64:8 11:24 93:5 96:7,23 substantive Suprounding 27:17 28: simpl 49:21 95:15 85:6,16,25 109:21 102:2 39:6 12:11,17. simple 30:7 sourd 53:11 86:22 93:5,11 story 10:1 11:11 subtantive Suprounding 27:17 28: 28:24 47:24	sightings 56:12	51:19 53:7	spotted 38:8	17:1,2,4 21:19	77:21	43:11 52:23	57:24 58:15
significant 29:3 58:9 63:12,16 staff 7:5 29:16 30:5,12 submission 69:20,25 70:10 86:13 107 38:11 64:11 65:24,24 66:18 stage 5:2 23:7,17 30:12,23 31:1 101:6 73:13 74:6,14 107:13 significantly 66:19 67:3 46: 280:25 34:19 53:2 submissions 74:17 78:2 tap 38:20 108:2 71:5,6,8 82:23 88:25 99:23 55:2 56:5 61:7 98:20 85:8,19 87:16 tap 38:20 signs 8:22 84:24 86:11,12 100:6 61:8 64:7 submit 100:3 92:1 93:4 37:11 simalia 63:11,12 86:13 83:34 stage 54:20 56:4 66:12 67:12,16 substantive surprised 102:6 12:11,17 Simiple 30:7 sorted 41:16 stamped 29:23 72:5 88:25 substantive Surprised 102:6 surprised 102:6 12:11,17 13:15,18 1 Simole 30:7 sorted 41:16 stand 35:7 50:16 89:3 92:9,17 68:24 47:24 14:13 25: simple 30:7 sorted 51:11 86:22 93:5,11 story 10:111:11 subte 64:22 suspect 56: 55:24 te	0 0				subjected 47:8		63:24 82:20
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$							
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0				
signs 8:2284:24 86:11,12100:661:8 64:7submit 100:392:1 93:437:11similar 63:11,1286:13 88:3,4stages 54:20 56:466:12 67:12,16subsequent109:1team 10:4 1106:290:8,18 94:1261:23 63:2267:19,21 70:298:10 107:18surprised 102:612:11,17,Similarly 46:396:8stamped 29:2372:5 88:25substantialsurprised 102:612:11,17,Simon 42:20sorted 41:16stam d 35:7 50:1689:3 92:9,1768:2447:2441:13 25;simple 30:7sorted 39:7 93:1464:8 71:2493:5 96:7,23substantiveSurrounding27:17 28:simply 49:2195:1585:6,16,25109:21102:239:6team's 29:873:7 79:18sound 53:1186:22 93:5,11story 10:111:11subte 64:22suspect 5:6 56:24technicality91:1 97:2166:21 75:2394:5 96:511:12 15:5:25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successful 82:6suspects 55:1924:21109:4,1231:5,25standard 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telpathy 4099:933:5 54:25standard 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telpathy 4099:933:5 54:25standard 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telpathy 4099:933:5 54:25standard 7:831:22 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14							
similar 63:11,1286:13 88:3,4stages 54:20 56:466:12 67:12,16subsequent109:1team 10:4 1106:290:8,18 94:1261:23 63:2267:19,21 70:298:10 107:18surprised 102:612:11,17,Similarly 46:396:8stamp 29:2372:5 88:25substantialsurprisingly13:5,18 1Simon 42:20sorted 41:16stand 35:7 50:1689:3 92:9,1768:2447:2414:13 25:simple 30:7sorts 39:7 93:1464:8 71:2493:5 96:7,23substantiveSurrounding27:17 28:simply 49:2195:1585:6,16,25109:21102:239:6team's 29:873:7 79:18sound 53:1186:22 93:5,11story 10:11:11subtle 64:22suspect 5:6 55:24technicality91:1 97:2166:21 75:2394:5 96:511:12 15:5,2365:1365:5 66:24technicality98:15 99:1778:20100:17 102:1917:16 21:25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22tellepathy 499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22tellepathy 499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:5 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>							
$106:2$ $90:8,18\ 94:12$ $61:23\ 63:22$ $67:19,21\ 70:2$ $98:10\ 107:18$ $surprised\ 102:6$ $12:11,17,$ Similarly 46:3 $96:8$ $stamped\ 29:23$ $72:5\ 88:25$ $substantial$ $surprisingly$ $13:5,18\ 1$ Simon 42:20sorted 41:16 $stand\ 35:7\ 50:16$ $89:3\ 92:9,17$ $68:24$ $47:24$ $14:13\ 25:$ simple 30:7sorts 39:7\ 93:14 $64:8\ 71:24$ $93:5\ 96:7,23$ $substantive$ Surounding $27:17\ 28:$ simple $30:7$ sound 53:11 $86:22\ 93:5,11$ $story\ 10:1\ 11:11$ $suble\ 64:22$ $suspect\ 5:6\ 55:24$ technicality $73:7\ 79:18$ sound 53:11 $86:22\ 93:5,11$ $story\ 10:1\ 11:11$ $suble\ 64:22$ $suspect\ 5:6\ 55:24$ technicality $91:1\ 97:21$ $66:21\ 75:23$ $94:5\ 96:5$ $11:12\ 15:5,23$ $65:13$ $65:5\ 66:24$ technicality $91:1\ 97:21$ $66:21\ 75:23$ $94:5\ 96:5$ $11:12\ 15:5,23$ $successful \ 22:12$ $69:6$ $14:7\ 21:1$ $100:18\ 101:8$ soure\ 15:11 $standard\ 60:12$ $22:21,24,25$ $successful \ 22:6$ $83:24$ $Technology$ $single\ 29:5,24$ $32:3,19,20,25$ $88:11,20\ 90:1$ $31:3,7,9,11,13$ $28:11$ $suspect\ 81:24$ $telepathy\ 4$ $99:9$ $33:5\ 54:25$ $standard\ 7:8$ $31:25\ 32:14,17$ $sufficient\ 7:5$ $55:14,19\ 64:22$ $telepathy\ 4$ $99:9$ $33:5\ 54:25$ $standard\ 7:8$ $31:25\ 32:14,17$ $suspect\ 81:24$ $telepathy\ 4$ $99:9$ $33:5\ 54:25$ $standa$							
Similarly 46:3 Simon 42:2096:8 sorted 41:16stamped 29:23 stand 35:7 50:1672:5 88:25 89:3 92:9,17substantial 68:24surprisingly 47:2413:5,18 1.simple 30:7 sorts 39:7 93:14sorts 39:7 93:1464:8 71:2493:5 96:7,23 93:5 96:7,23substantive substantiveSurrounding 39:627:17 28:simply 49:21 91:1 97:2195:1585:6,16,25109:21102:239:6team's 29:873:7 79:18 98:15 99:17sound 53:11 78:2086:22 93:5,11story 10:1 11:11 standard 60:12subte 64:22suspect 5:6 55:24 65:13technicality technicality100:18 101:8 99:9source 15:11 31:12,14,15,24standard 60:12 60:21 72:2322:21,24,25successful 62:12 successful 928:669:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8 99:9sis5 54:25standard 60:12 33:5 54:2522:21,24,25successful 928:6 suspects 18:24suspect 55:19 telpathy 44 telpathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:8 standards 7:831:2,3,7,9,11,13 32:22,24 32:2109:10 109:1069:16 70:14 69:16 70:1423:13 27: 23:13 27: 23:13 27: 32:22,24 32:2109:10 69:16 70:1423:13 27: 23:13 27: 23:13 27:1150:12,19 55:14,19 64:2223:13 27: 23:13 27: 23:13 27:1150:12,19 55:14,19 64:2230:10 33: 35:9,11 341:15 44:5 99:1777:12,19,25stard 47:1 39:6 40:251:7,15,18,23 51:0,13 54:12104:16 105:13 109:1076:13 80:9 69:15,1150:12,19 51:14,1750:7 97:12 94:1794:17 96:2041:10 46:16 61:	,			· · · · ·			team 10:4 12:7
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					12:11,17,17
simple 30:7 simply 49:21sorts 39:7 93:1464:8 71:24 85:6,16,2593:5 96:7,23 109:21substantive 102:2Surrounding 39:627:17 28: team's 29:873:7 79:18 91:1 97:21sound 53:11 66:21 75:2386:22 93:5,11 94:5 96:5story 10:1 11:11 11:12 15:5,23subte 64:22 65:13suspect 5:6 55:24 65:5 66:24team's 29:8 technicality technicality technicality technicality technicality successful 62:1298:15 99:17 100:18 101:8r8:00 source 15:11 31:12,14,15,24standard 60:12 60:21 72:2322:21,24,25 23:6 30:4,6,20successful 62:12 successful 928:669:614:7 21:1 24:21100:18 101:8 109:4,12source 15:11 31:12,14,15,24standard 60:12 60:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20 23:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:6 suce 17:10 28:687:24 suspects 18:24Technology telepathy 4499:933:5 54:25 33:5 54:25standards 7:8 standards 7:831:25 32:14,17 31:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:5 sugers 36:2255:14,19 64:22 suspects 18:24tell 1:11,22 23:13 27: 30:10 33: 32:22,24 33:2109:10 69:16 70:1469:16 70:14 23:13 27: 30:10 33: 35:9,11 341:15 44:5 41:15 44:5 77:12,19,25start 1:21 2:5 start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,8 51:0,13 54:1299:12,14 104:16 105:13suspended 3:3 76:13 80:935:9,11 3 35:9,11 341:15 44:5 99:12,1477:12,19,25 suspect 61:14 89:15start 1:21 2:5 55:8,19 53:6,899:12,14 99:12,14suspended 3:3 suspect 75:1150:12,19 50:12,1945:9 49:17 99:12,1984:8 86:15,17 							13:5,18 14:5
simply 49:2195:1585:6,16,25109:21102:239:6team's 29:873:7 79:18sound 53:1186:22 93:5,11story 10:1 11:11subte 64:22suspect 5:6 55:24technicality91:1 97:2166:21 75:2394:5 96:511:12 15:5,2365:1365:5 66:24technicality98:15 99:1778:20100:17 102:1917:16 21:25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successful 92:6687:2424:21109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telepathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telepathy 4492:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:6 46:14suggesting 78:10				· · · · ·			14:13 25:25
73:779:18sound 53:1186:2293:5,11story 10:111:11subtle 64:22suspect 5:655:24technicality91:197:2166:2175:2394:596:511:1215:5,2365:1365:1365:566:2414:721:14100:18101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successfully 28:6suspect 55:1924:21109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:2172:2323:630:4,6,20sued 17:1028:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,25standards 7:831:2532:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,1964:2269:1614:721:1499:933:554:25standing 10:2332:22,2432:2109:1069:1669:1669:1614:11,2292:1167:1374:19,22101:743:2449:18Sugar 36:2274:1283:1330:1033:sir 1:436:2274:2475:2,4start 1:2155:19,18,23suggest 80:10suspicion 75:1130:1035:9,11341:1544:577:12,19,25start 1:2155:19,56:414:16105:1335:9,11350:12,1945:949:1784:886:15,1739:640:253:10,1354:12104:16105:1376:1380:951:14,17101:5,19sourced 61:1469:1555:956:461:4suggested 105:822:1668:1177:2101:5,19sourced 61:1469:15	-						27:17 28:3
73:7 79:18 91:1 97:21sound 53:1186:22 93:5,11 94:5 96:5story 10:1 11:11 11:12 15:5,23subtle 64:22 65:13suspect 5:6 55:24 65:5 66:24technicality technique 198:15 99:1778:20100:17 102:1917:16 21:25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successfully 28:6suspect 5:5:1924:21109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,2588:11,20 90:131:3,7,9,11,1328:11suspects 18:24telpathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telpathy 4499:959:10 60:5standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggested 105:822:1668:11 77:101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4	simply 49:21						team's 29:8
91:1 97:2166:21 75:2394:5 96:511:12 15:5,2365:1365:5 66:24technique 198:15 99:1778:20100:17 102:1917:16 21:25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successfully 28:6suspected 55:1924:21109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,2588:11,20 90:131:3,7,9,11,1328:11suspects 18:24telpathy 499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22telpathy 499:933:5 54:25standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:1,4750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5 <t< td=""><td>73:7 79:18</td><td>sound 53:11</td><td>86:22 93:5,11</td><td>story 10:1 11:11</td><td>subtle 64:22</td><td>suspect 5:6 55:24</td><td>technicality 7:24</td></t<>	73:7 79:18	sound 53:11	86:22 93:5,11	story 10:1 11:11	subtle 64:22	suspect 5:6 55:24	technicality 7:24
98:15 99:1778:20100:17 102:1917:16 21:25successful 62:1269:614:7 21:1100:18 101:8source 15:11standard 60:1222:21,24,25successfully 28:6suspected 55:1924:21109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,2588:11,20 90:131:3,7,9,11,1328:11suspects 18:24telepathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22tell 1:11,22sinster 90:259:10 60:5standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22source 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggested 105:822:1668:11 77:101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25	91:1 97:21	66:21 75:23	94:5 96:5	11:12 15:5,23	65:13		technique 13:23
100:18 101:8 109:4,12source 15:11standard 60:12 60:21 72:2322:21,24,25 23:6 30:4,6,20successfully 28:6 sued 17:10 28:6suspected 55:19 87:2424:21 Technology telepathy 4499:933:5 54:2588:11,20 90:131:3,7,9,11,13 31:25 32:14,1728:11suspects 18:24 55:14,19 64:22telepathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:8 standards 7:831:25 32:14,17 32:22,24 33:2sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22 69:16 70:14tell 1:11,22sinister 90:259:10 60:5standing 10:23 start 1:29,2232:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:14 69:16 70:1423:13 27: 23:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22 101:7101:743:24 49:18 51:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10 suspended 3:3suspended 3:3 35:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25 94:17start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,8 51:0,13 54:1299:12,14 104:16 105:13suspicion 75:11 76:13 80:950:12,19 51:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran sweping 98:1455:1,18 6 68:11 77: 80:23 22:1698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:14 90:1569:1555:9 56:4 61:4 55:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10 85:25 99:4,5sweping 98:14 87:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:15 66:21 67:1,2,285:25 99:4,5 105:11,13sworn 50:9 sworn 50:9103:16 telling 20:22	98:15 99:17	78:20	100:17 102:19	17:16 21:25	successful 62:12	69:6	14:7 21:14
109:4,1231:12,14,15,2460:21 72:2323:6 30:4,6,20sued 17:10 28:687:24Technologysingle 29:5,2432:3,19,20,2588:11,20 90:131:3,7,9,11,1328:11suspects 18:24telepathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22tell 1:11,22sinister 90:259:10 60:5standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:22							
single 29:5,2432:3,19,20,2588:11,20 90:131:3,7,9,11,1328:11suspects 18:24telepathy 4499:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22tell 1:11,22sinister 90:259:10 60:5standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:22							
99:933:5 54:25standards 7:831:25 32:14,17sufficient 7:555:14,19 64:22tell 1:11,22sinister 90:259:10 60:5standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:22							
sinister 90:259:10 60:5standing 10:2332:22,24 33:2109:1069:16 70:1423:13 27:92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:23	0		,				
92:1167:13 74:19,22101:743:24 49:18Sugar 36:2274:12 83:1530:10 33:sir 1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:23				· · · · ·		,	
sir1:4 36:2274:24 75:2,4stands 47:151:7,15,18,23suggest 80:10suspended 3:335:9,11 341:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggesting 78:1022:1668:11 77:101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:23							
41:15 44:577:12,19,25start 1:21 2:552:8,19 53:6,899:12,14suspicion 75:1150:12,1945:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggested 105:822:1668:11 77:101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:23		· · · · · ·			0		
45:9 49:1784:8 86:15,1739:6 40:253:10,13 54:12104:16 105:1376:13 80:951:14,1750:7 97:1294:17 96:2041:10 46:1654:13,15,19,20105:21Sven-Goran55:1,18 698:5,20 99:22sourced 61:1469:1555:9 56:4 61:4suggested 105:822:1668:11 77:101:5,19sources 27:18started 1:2561:22 63:8,19suggesting 78:10sweeping 98:1487:2 88:4102:15 103:2,930:23 32:1250:2364:6,16 66:1585:25 99:4,5sworn 50:9103:16107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:22					00	-	35:9,11 36:24
50:7 97:12 94:17 96:20 41:10 46:16 54:13,15,19,20 105:21 Sven-Goran 55:1,18 6 98:5,20 99:22 sourced 61:14 69:15 55:9 56:4 61:4 suggested 105:8 22:16 68:11 77: 101:5,19 sources 27:18 started 1:25 61:22 63:8,19 suggesting 78:10 sweeping 98:14 87:2 88:4 102:15 103:2,9 30:23 32:12 50:23 64:6,16 66:15 85:25 99:4,5 sworn 50:9 103:16 107:22 108:7 55:2,4 56:16 starting 57:1 66:21 67:1,2,2 105:11,13 sympathetic telling 20:22				, , ,	<i>'</i>		50:12,19 51:7
98:5,20 99:22 sourced 61:14 69:15 55:9 56:4 61:4 suggested 105:8 22:16 68:11 77: 101:5,19 sources 27:18 started 1:25 61:22 63:8,19 suggesting 78:10 sweeping 98:14 87:2 88:4 102:15 103:2,9 30:23 32:12 50:23 64:6,16 66:15 85:25 99:4,5 sworn 50:9 103:16 107:22 108:7 55:2,4 56:16 starting 57:1 66:21 67:1,2,2 105:11,13 sympathetic telling 20:22							51:14,17 52:6
101:5,19 102:15 103:2,9sources 27:18 30:23 32:12started 1:25 50:2361:22 63:8,19 64:6,16 66:15suggesting 78:10 85:25 99:4,5sweeping 98:14 sworn 50:987:2 88:4 103:16 telling 20:22107:22 108:755:2,4 56:16starting 57:166:21 67:1,2,2105:11,13sympathetictelling 20:22				, , ,			55:1,18 62:7
102:15 103:2,9 30:23 32:12 50:23 64:6,16 66:15 85:25 99:4,5 sworn 50:9 103:16 107:22 108:7 55:2,4 56:16 starting 57:1 66:21 67:1,2,2 105:11,13 sympathetic telling 20:22							68:11 77:14
102:15 103:2,9 30:23 32:12 50:23 64:6,16 66:15 85:25 99:4,5 sworn 50:9 103:16 107:22 108:7 55:2,4 56:16 starting 57:1 66:21 67:1,2,2 105:11,13 sympathetic telling 20:23	101:5,19	sources 27:18	started 1:25	61:22 63:8,19	suggesting 78:10	sweeping 98:14	87:2 88:4
107:22 108:7 55:2,4 56:16 starting 57:1 66:21 67:1,2,2 105:11,13 sympathetic telling 20:23	102:15 103:2,9	30:23 32:12	50:23	64:6,16 66:15	85:25 99:4,5	sworn 50:9	
	107:22 108:7	55:2,4 56:16	starting 57:1	66:21 67:1,2,2	105:11,13	sympathetic	
109:12 J 50:21,23 57:11 starts 15:14 90:4 67:5,22 68:8 suggestion 49:18 24:6 49:3 59:7	109:12	56:21,23 57:11	starts 13:14 90:4	67:5,22 68:8	suggestion 49:18	24:6	49:3 59:7
		,		,			

675, 575, 11, 14 $699, 703, 24, 72, 91.0$ $72, 80, 88, 24, 92.1$ $79, 11, 24$ $49, 19, 100, 11, 124, 142, 142, 142, 142, 142, 142,$							1 450 12
62:16 95:11 43:10.25 44:13 58:1 59:1.16 49:13 66:6 75:6 verm1 2e:18 56:13 60:23 10:11 44:23 45:1.21 60:2 6:12 transcripti 40:18 87:1 67:13 60:11 37:13 98:1 10:12 10:12 10:12 transcripti 40:18 87:13 98:1 108:7:1 10:12 10:12 10:12 translate 77:16 10:12 10	77 10 25 02 12	42,10,22,22	10 5 10 5 51 5		50 10 50 0		51.05.50.01
984 44:23 45:24 46:12 79:13 80:18 80:18 80:18 80:18 80:18 80:18 78:19 78:13 78:13 78:13 78:13 78:13 78:13 78:14 78:14 78:14 78:14 78:14 78:14 78:14 77:13 88:14 10:11 1							
tempted 215 45244610 62146412 798.9 972.9 98730 9818 77.92.3 78.4 499 514 54.8 762 7818.25 77.6 76.7 57.61.1 8.313 8417 997.10 translator 57.15 Utranslator 57.15 Utranslator 57.15 76.5 75.11.4 6618 67.1 9017 911.20 921.6 41.24 99.12 92.16 41.24 41.24 42.1 55.5 61.1 83.9 76.5 75.7 14.1 46.618 67.1 9017 911.20 921.6 41.24 41.24 49.19 97.04 97.19 452.47.21 90.9 70.24 72.91,19 93.24 94.12 translator 57.15 Utranslator 57.15 Utranslator 57.15 100.47 (19.8 96.4 3) 100.71 108.71 translator 57.15 (19.8 96.4 3) 100.71 108.21 translator 57.15 (19.8 96.4 3) 100.71 108.21 translator 57.15 (19.8 96.4 3) 100.71 108.21 translator 57.15 (19.8 10.2 0) 100.71 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.21 translator 57.15 (19.8 10.2 0) 100.71 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.22 100.21 translator 57.15 (19.8 10.2 0) 100.7 10.22 100.22 100.21 translator 57.15 (10.8 10.1 0) 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.21 translator 57.15 (19.8 10.1 0) 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.22 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.22 100.2 100.21 100.2 100.22 100.22 100.2 1							
ten $12:18:19:23$ 47.48:11 79:23:78:14 409.514.54:8, 762.78:18,24 79:23:78:14 409.514.54:8, 762.78:18,25 79:23:78:14 409.514.54:8, 762.78:14 10:27.9 $10:27.9$ $10:37.13$ $10:37.14$ $10:37.13$ $10:37.14$ $10:37.13$ $10:37.14$ $10:37.13$ $10:37.14$ $10:$							
$ \begin{array}{c} 7.79.23 \ {rst.} 4 & 99.514 \ 5.48.16 \ {rst.} 44.15 \ 4.52.23 \ {rst.} 41.5 \ 4.57.25 \ {rst.} 41.5 \ {rst.} $							
temor 71:1055:21.23 64479:1838translated 57:16 \overline{U} verait (4:2:3) $43:24:21$ 67:5 75:11.1466:18 07:199:17 91:13,14transplants \overline{U} <					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
term 4:18 (1)					tyle 70.0,14		
675, 575, 11, 14 $699, 703, 99, 19$ $90, 179, 113, 14$ $113, 24$ $transplants$ $112, 24$ $trie b, 502, 24, 601, 162, 22$ $verify, 502, 24, 601, 162, 22, verify, 502, 46, 611, 102, 112, 102, 102, 102, 102, 112, 11$							45:2 47:2 50:2
terminology 76.8 70:24 72:9.10 93:24 94:15 transported 75:8 totimately 88:14 torify 50:01 77:13 84:8 terms 418 10:16 74:27:61.8 96:41.5 106:22 52:14 transported torify 50:01 77:13 84:8 56:39:07 97:11.5 99 56:13 85:7 77:12 72:01			,				
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
terms 4:18 0:16 23:11 57:2 77:12 207 77:12 77:12 207 77		· · · · · ·					86:8 94:9 96:8
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							96:15,18,25,25
61:13 65:1178:24,24 79:21times 51:9 90:12tree 91:23uncover d 79:19timing 5:66100:14:16,75:9 77:982:15 83:8.12tipped 7:3 37:184:24underhald 5:54:0.12trial 5:58:0.14Victor 28:7100:21109:1384:19 85:10.21tissue 79:2440:18 44:25tissue 79:24underhald 5:54:0.14100:21100:2210:61:61:1189:15 92:12.2tissue 79:2440:18 44:25tissue 79:24underhald 5:34:0.12tissue 79:2410:61:61:1189:15 92:12.8.23title 2:65:6.27:8tind 9:17 78:1211:11 136:21underhald 8:2410:61:65:1198:29:97:10.22:394:1936:16 42:11title 1:10:12:10visite 8:2210:12:17:20:11today 70:346:15.24:48:1536:13 41:17visite 1:25:310:12:10:22:10:22:1010:12:10:10:11today 70:346:15.24:48:1536:13 41:17visite 1:23:310:12:10:1721:22:42:12title 1:10:21:839:14.23:24:92:22:12:10:33:13visite 8:51:1010:44:44:71:1010:17.1725:24:22:22:12:12:12:11:10:13:1110:07:10:02:10:12visite 8:51:1010:42:21:09:2446:98:82:59:16:38:12tioday 79:23:12:23:12:10:13:1110:07:10:02:10:12visite 8:61:610:42:10:12:1110:12:10:13:1110:07:10:02:14:16:38:12visite 8:61:6visite 8:62:11:03:1110:42:21:09:2441:22:41:14:45:1322:29:73:15:10:07:8visite 8:61:6visite 8:62:211:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:12:1		77:12,20 78:18					97:1,15 99:17
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							100:14,16,22
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	67:23 72:16			tremendous			102:17 103:9
				84:24			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	88:19 92:9	83:14,22 84:8		trial 3:5,8 40:14			106:24 108:18
$ test end 109:22,23 \\ test mony 1418 \\ test mony 1418 \\ test mony 1418 \\ test sol, 13 \\ series sol, 14 \\ series sol, 14 \\ series sol, 14 \\ series sol, 13 \\ series sol, 14 \\ series sol, 13 \\ series sol, 14 \\ series sol, 1$	109:13	84:19 85:10,21	tissue 79:24	40:18 44:25			108:21 109:20
			80:20,21	tribunal 48:24		0	109:23
			title 20:15	tried 24:19 47:23			
$ tests 80:1,3 82:3 \\ stress 93:2 \\ stress 70:1,2 73:2 \\ stress 70:1,2 \\ stress 70:1,2$		· · · · · ·	titles 26:5,6 27:8	103:13			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	tests 80:1,3 82:3		27:10	Trinity 5:17 8:12			website 21:5
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{true} true true true true true true true true$							websites 3:17
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	text 70:12 73:2	97:10,22,23	94:19	36:16 42:11			Wednesday 1:1
							week 11:20 38:5
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			told 12:7 20:11		47:15 48:19		38:7,16 77:4,5
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	41:12,15 44:2	102:3 106:9	23:21 24:1	85:17	76:12 92:23		weeks 51:10,12
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					93:1,4,13		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					97:24,25 99:5		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					100:7 106:21		
$ theory 81:15,16 \\ 104:12 \\ third 71:92.09:12 \\ they'd 51:24 \\ 13:14 35:24 \\ 94:23 95:23 \\ 105:8,9 \\ 105:8,9 \\ 98:23 \\ 106:restanding \\ 98:24 \\ 100:24 101:25 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:25 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 100:14 102:20 \\ 10$			59:11 63:18		108:6,23,24		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	theory 81:15,16				109:19,24		went 5:8 11:7
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,		vow 85:6,16	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						86:22	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			-			waiting 3:8	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						walked 43:24	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,		100121101120		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
things 17:6,20threatened $34:17$ 85:15 $86:22$ total $46:5$ $51:9$ truthfulness $2:14$ $104:12$ want $19:8 29:1$ we're $17:9 35$ $30:23 40:3$ $36:24$ $38:7,16 57:11$ $51:17$ $51:18$ $38:7,16 57:11$ $51:17$ $38:7,16 57:11$ $51:17$ $38:142:33 37:12$ $38:144:10$ $47:12 57:4$ $38:144:10$ $47:12 57:4$ $38:1 44:10$ $67:8 69:10$ $71:7 86:13$ $88:7 99:18$ touchstone $46:21$ $Tryhorn 23:16$ $51:17$ $76:5 96:22$ $74:6,6 79:10$ $90:13 95:25$ $103:7,11,12$ tougher $65:6$ $61:25 95:11$ unreliable $32:21$ $30:3,5,24 31:4$ $41:11,11 4$ think 4:6 6:4 $84:8$ tougher $65:6$ $61:25 95:11$ unreliable $32:21$ $30:3,5,24 31:4$ $41:11,11 4$ think 4:6 6:4 $84:8$ tougher $65:6$ $61:25 95:11$ unreliable $32:21$ $30:3,5,24 31:4$ $41:11,11 4$ $15:21,24 16:7$ time $42:1 6:6$ $36:17$ turn $3:8 75:24$ $30:3,5,24 31:4$ $30:14 28:20$ $30:3,5,24 31:4$ $16:15 18:15$ $7:25 12:1 13:3$ traded $38:22$ turned $31:3,9$ $96:25$ $30:3,5,24 31:4$ $30:14 38:20$ $30:14 43:13$ $22:14 23:19$ $14:19 16:11$ trading $36:3$ $77:11$ upwards $10:3$ $71:8 100:1$ $20:15 22:9$ $24:12 35:3$ $26:9 28:12$ tragel $91:2$ $66:15$ $86:7 89:21$ $39:24 41:34$ $39:24 45:18$ $31:12 35:3$ $26:9 28:12$ tragel $91:2$ $66:15$ $86:7 89:21$ $39:24 45:18$ $31:12 39:16$ $35:19 37:$			-				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	57:24 63:2,24
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			•				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $							we've 6:23 18:19
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			0				41:11,11 45:9
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		-					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$							80:19,21 97:4
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$,						Wharf 13:20
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$,			· · · · ·			whatsoever 8:21
16:15 18:157:25 12:1 13:3traded 38:22turned 31:3,9upset 83:2435:14 43:13whilst 3:8 5:122:14 23:1914:19 16:11trading 36:377:11upwards 10:345:7 48:238:20 16:2024:18 25:19,2120:10 21:17,2137:22turns 105:14use 24:21 34:1933:1120:15 22:926:11 28:522:1,20,20,22tragedy 104:10TV 22:17 53:546:20 80:8wanting 33:1120:15 22:934:12 35:326:9 28:12trained 1:25 5:666:15useful 25:20wants 97:943:2,5,2036:14,17 37:335:19 37:1550:23two 3:17 13:3useful 25:2016:14 22:24widespread39:16,17 40:1341:23 42:1,135:5,8 8:2039:21 41:24utterly 109:1539:24 45:18wife 36:25 46Wiggins 7:21							whichever 57:5
22:14 23:19 14:19 16:11 trading 36:3 77:11 upwards 10:3 43.7 48.23 8:20 16:20 24:18 25:19,21 20:10 21:17,21 37:22 turns 105:14 use 24:21 34:19 46:20 80:8 71:8 100:1 20:15 22:9 26:11 28:5 22:1,20,20,22 tragedy 104:10 TV 22:17 53:5 66:13 63:9 86:7 89:21 wanting 37:11 20:15 22:9 34:12 35:3 26:9 28:12 trained 1:25 5:6 66:15 useful 25:20 wass 't 2:17 9:1 43:2,5,20 36:14,17 37:3 35:19 37:15 50:23 two 3:17 13:3 usual 18:24 24:20 39:3,23 21:10 25:12 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 39:24 45:18 Wiggins 7:21			traded 38:22				whilst 3:8 5:16
24:18 25:19,21 20:10 21:17,21 37:22 turns 105:14 use 24:21 34:19 vanting 33:11 20:15 22:9 26:11 28:5 22:1,20,20,22 tragedy 104:10 tragic 91:2 60:13 63:9 86:7 89:21 wanting 33:11 20:15 22:9 34:12 35:3 26:9 28:12 trained 1:25 5:6 66:15 seful 25:20 useful 25:20 16:14 22:24 43:2,5,20 37:17 38:13,21 38:12 39:16 training 4:24 5:4 14:4 31:3 69:21 39:24 45:18 21:10 25:12 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 47:24 49:19 Wiggins 7:21	22:14 23:19			,	-		8:20 16:20
26:11 28:5 22:1,20,20,22 tragedy 104:10 TV 22:17 53:5 46:20 80:8 wanting 33.11 26:12 42:4 32:1 33:20,25 23:5,7,25 24:8 tragic 91:2 60:13 63:9 86:7 89:21 wants 97:9 43:2,5,20 34:12 35:3 26:9 28:12 trained 1:25 5:6 66:15 useful 25:20 16:14 22:24 43:2,5,20 36:14,17 37:3 35:19 37:15 50:23 two 3:17 13:3 useful 25:20 16:14 22:24 21:10 25:12 37:17 38:13,21 38:12 39:16 training 4:24 5:4 14:4 31:3 69:21 39:24 45:18 wife 36:25 46 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 47:24 49:19 Wiggins 7:21		20:10 21:17,21	37:22	turns 105:14	-		20:15 22:9
32:1 33:20,25 23:5,7,25 24:8 tragic 91:2 60:13 63:9 86:7 89:21 wants 97.9 43:2,5,20 34:12 35:3 26:9 28:12 trained 1:25 5:6 66:15 useful 25:20 useful 25:20 16:14 22:24 21:10 25:12 36:14,17 37:3 35:19 37:15 50:23 two 3:17 13:3 14:4 31:3 69:21 39:24 45:18 21:10 25:12 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 47:24 49:19 Wiggins 7:21			tragedy 104:10				26:12 42:4
34:12 35:3 26:9 28:12 trained 1:25 5:6 66:15 useful 25:20 16:14 22:24 widespread 36:14,17 37:3 35:19 37:15 50:23 two 3:17 13:3 useful 25:20 16:14 22:24 24:20 39:3,23 37:17 38:13,21 38:12 39:16 training 4:24 5:4 14:4 31:3 69:21 39:24 45:18 wife 36:25 46 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 47:24 49:19 Wiggins 7:21		23:5,7,25 24:8					
36:14,17 37:3 35:19 37:15 50:23 two 3:17 13:3 usual 18:24 10:14 22:24 21:10 25:12 37:17 38:13,21 38:12 39:16 training 4:24 5:4 14:4 31:3 69:21 39:24 45:18 wife 36:25 46 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 47:24 49:19 Wiggins 7:21			trained 1:25 5:6				widespread
37:17 38:13,21 38:12 39:16 training 4:24 5:4 14:4 31:3 69:21 39:24 45:18 wife 36:25 46 39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 39:24 45:18 Wiggins 7:21			50:23				21:10 25:12
39:16,17 40:13 41:23 42:1,13 5:5,8 8:20 39:21 41:24 utterly 109:15 39:24 43.18 Wiggins 7:21	37:17 38:13,21	38:12 39:16	training 4:24 5:4	14:4 31:3		,	wife 36:25 46:6
			,	39:21 41:24	utterly 109:15		Wiggins 7:21
	41:16,25 42:2	42:16 45:11	50:24	44:12,22 57:12		77.27777.17	William 1:12
		I	I	I	I	l	

won 28:11 wond 41:15 $70:23 00:5$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $92:9,16 94:8,9$ $97:18 98:11$ $107:20$ $76:25 77:2,15$ $7:24 50:1$ $77:24 50:1$ $77:24 50:1$ $77:24 50:1$ $77:24 50:1$ $77:24 50:1$ $77:24 50:1$ $17 105:14$ $15 21:4 38:17$ $15 21:4 38:1715 50:22 62:1118 56:15.1899:999:963:25 69:519 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 57:22419 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 56:2319 57:2419 99:9:131999 6:21 15:7,81999 6:21 15:7,8104:4104:4wrong doing 15:223:4 26:877:6,16,1797:210 76:2177:5,13,152006 6:18 7:1323:4 26:877:5,13,152006 6:18 7:122000 223:222001 35:202002 23:222003 51:22000 35:122002 33:222003 51:22003 5$			•			
withhed 42:0 withhed 42:0 32:12 33:4 withold 31:24 32:12 33:4 withold 31:24 32:12 33:4 withold 31:24 32:12 33:4 34:14 62: 34:14 62:	wished 62.11	26:16 21 24	vears 4.22, 13.3	23 62:8		
withhold 31:24 without 31:24 size 32:12 33:4 with set 14.31.9 with set 14.31.9 with set 14.31.9 with set 14.31.9 with set 12.3 31:14 0:32 24:23 27:16 31:14 0:23 32:12 33:4 32:12 33:4 33:12 32:12 33:4 33:12 33:12 33:4 33:12 3						
32:12 33:4 worshippers 48:7 50:20.25 100:20 51:32 49:3 worshippers 667 76:21 26 67:72.08:1 31:34 17:22 33:16 43:2 25 0:20 27 3:18 24:23 27:16 648 73:6 77:5 48:12 49:24 29 48:4 69:9 31:13 44 87:12 48:84 87:12 48:84 27 34:2 49:55 67 write 20:3 40:10 religiest 38:20 81:13 97:14 25 98:23 646,76 613 1 169:10 10:15 3164 78:25 97:100:12,7 77:51 87:64 10:32:4 3164 78:25 3164 78:25 97:100:12,7 77:75 18 76:44 10:32:4 3164 78:25 3164 78:25 97:100:12,7 77:61 10:17 3164 78:25 3164 78:25 3164 78:25 97:100:12,7 97:10:12 10:24 3164 78:18 3164 78:25 37:28 97:10:12,12 98:11:01:17 10:47:17 3164 78:25 37:28 37:28 97:10:12,12 98:11:13 10:17:17 3164 78:18 31:13 31:13 31:13 10:21:01:11 11:18:18:10 10:14:17 31:18 31:18:18 31:18:18 31:18:18						
witness 14,13,19 84,18 667 70:21 25 67 712 (38:1 13:14 17:22 33:16 43:8 34:11 46:3 25 57:12 (38:1) 30:10 32:8 78:3 82:15 34:11 46:3 29 48:4 69:9 30:10 32:8 78:3 82:15 35:20 74:18 20 48:4 69:9 30:10 32:8 78:3 82:15 10:2-4:10 104:6 36:3 3:52 0.74:18 30:10 32:8 78:13 82:15 10:2-4:10 104:6 36:3 3:52 0.74:18 30:10 32:8 64:27 6:01 3 1 30:00 36:6 99:10 00:11:2 67:9 70:20 1 69:10 10:31:5 316:3 4:22:5 100:12:10 10:2:7 72:15 73:12 10:2:1 36:4 8:2:5 100:12:10 10:2:7 74:15 88:11 36:4 8:2:5 36:4 8:1:8 100:12:10 10:2:7 10:6 1:16 10:6 1:16 31:6 3:4:1:8 100:12:10 10:2:1 10:7 4:18 36:6 1:7:3 37:7 8:8:10 witnessing 15:2 17:9 24:5 10:6 1:16 36:6 1:7:4:11 70:2:10 99:11:9 10:6 1:16 11:6 7:4:11 5:7:15 3:2:8 77:10 10:2:10 97:12 89:11 13:18:10:5:4:24 5:2:10 77:11 10:2:11 17:10:5:14 11:13:18:10:5:4:24 <						
			· · · · · ·			
13:14 17:22 33:16 34:11 46:3 27 35:18 30:10 22:8 78:3 83:12 34:11 46:3 27 35:18 30:10 22:8 78:3 83:12 34:11 46:3 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:18 27 35:19 35:20 74:15 36:10 36:38 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:39 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 36:36 3	, ,					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	· ·					
30:10 32:8 78:3 32:15 712:48:84 2 33:520 74:18 48:5 497 507. 94:5 109:2 reitgesi 38:00 33:520 74:18 99:5 100:11,23 61:22 63:19 1 31:624 82:25 99:5 100:11,23 61:67 66:13 1 31:64 82:25 1012:10 10:23 72:5 73:12 10:32:1 10:33:5 102:21 10:23 71:51 83:17 31:64 99:10 30:63 69:10 31:63 99:10 100:18 81:7 93:84 10:11 10:23 100:21 10:12 96:8,11,23 10:7:15 38:17 31:64 99:10 100:21 10:12 92:41 09:119 10:01:16 10:48 10:55 2:6 100:11 92:29:16 94:84 10:11 10:43:15 44:7 76:12 37:99:12 witnessed 13:21 97:32 90:5 11:44:19 47:02 2:22 word 21:11 92:29:16 94:84 12:44:19 57:15 32:26 word 21:12 97:13 98:11 13:80:16:10 45:15 32:6 99:9 63:25 69:5 19:96:23 77:12 74:13 32:10 99:9 63:25 69:5 19:96:23 77:12 74:13 32:10 99:9 63:25 69:5 19:96:23 71:97:24:13 46:16:19 99:9 63:25 69:5 19:96:23 71:97:24:13 99:9 63:25 69:5						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				29 40.4 09.9		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			102.4,10 104.0	3		
50:15 6:7 write 20:3 40:10 setigeist 38:20 36:1:3 90:5 42:18 6:62 60:13 6:79 70:20 1 36:29 8:44 10:2:10 10:23 72:27 73:12 10:20 10:31:5 36:49 8:14 31:62 9:84 10:2:10 10:23 72:57 73:12 10:20 10:31:5 31:64 9:21 31:64 9:21 10:2:10 10:23 72:57 73:12 10:20 10:31:5 31:64 9:21 31:64 9:21 10:2:10 10:23 72:57 73:12 10:51:10:1 10:51:15 8:17 31:64 9:21 10:2:10 12:12 96:81:12 96:81:12 10:71:15 8:17 31:64 9:21 10:2:10 12:12 96:81:12 10:71:15 8:17 31:67 9:82 37:91:2 witnessing 15:2 79:24 9:61:10 11:01:6 10:41:2 35:79:8 52:71:5 3:28 wond 31:12 92:14:10:91:9 11:11:41:9 12:14:80:17 65:10 52:11:5 5:26 wond 31:12 97:14:98:11 13:18:10:54:24 52:11:5 3:20 52:11:5 3:20 wond 31:15 59:22 6:21:11 13:18:10:54:24 52:11:5 3:20 77:12:122 77:13 9:123 74:13:13:11:1			Z			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			zengeist 56.20			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			1			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,					
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$,					
witnessed 13:21 96:8,11,23 40:77:65,12 37:98:21 44:77:65,12 37:98:21 92:41:09:11:9 10:04:16:10:48:23 57:98 100:2101:21 9:24:10:91:19 10:01:16:10:48:14 19 72:14 54:19:00:10.20 10:16:10:48:14 19 47(2):2:22 47(2):2:22 10:91:19 92:90:51 21:42:01:92:4 451:15:52:6 68:20 11.18 41:19 47(2):2:22 10:92:4 12:01:92:2 12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:01:92:12:00:02:12:02:01:12:01:02:12:01:02:12:00:02:12:02:02:12:02:02:12:02:01:12:01:02:12:00:02:12:02:12:02:02:12:02:02:12:02:02:12:02:12:00:02:12:02:12:02:12:00	,	,				
$ \begin{array}{c} 265.27.7 \\ witheress 48.22 \\ 375.615.23 \\ witheress 48.23 \\ witheress 48.23 \\ witheress 48.12 \\ word 4115 \\ 99.29 \\ 200.2 \\ 4115 \\ 99.9 \\ 99.29 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 76.25 \\ 77.51 \\ 80.18 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 77.5 \\ 80.18 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 77.5 \\ 80.18 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 115 \\ 99.9 \\ 3413 \\ 65.2 \\ word 125 \\ 107.20 \\ 107.2$						
witnesses 48:23 writes 69:25 $76:24 82:25$ $10.04 1:2$ $10.02 101:21$ 9:24 10:9 119 100 011:61 004:8 4 55:15 52:6 $68:2$ $11.18 41:9$ $12:16$ $68:20$ $45:15 52:6$ $68:20$ words 71:5 99:9 $92:9.16 94:8,9$ $41:22 18:27$ 5 $27:15 32:8$ $70:29$ $41:22 19:2-4$ $47(2):2:22$ words 71:8 $99:9$ $92:9.16 94:8,9$ $41:22 18:27$ 5 $72:15$ $72:450:1$ $13 18:10 54:24$ $52:15 32:8$ $79:10$ $70:29 71:8 98:11$ $13 18:10 54:24$ $53:10$ $66:17 46:11$ $70:23 97:18 98:11$ $13 18:10 54:24$ $53:10$ $99:9$ $63:23 69:5$ $19 56:23$ $67.000 36:23$ $46:61.61.9$ $99:9$ $63:23 69:5$ $19 56:23$ $67.000 36:23$ $46:66.16.19$ $99:99 :63:23 69:5$ $19 99:62:11 81 86:15.18 53:20 67.000 36:23 46:66.16.19 99:99 :63:23 69:5 19 99:62:13 1996 :22.1 77.24.50:1 1999 :22.13 1996 :22.13 1996 :22.13 77.76.16,17 91:23 107:15 1999 :22.13 1996 :22.13 1996 :22.13 77.76.16,17 91:23 107:15 1999 :22.13 1996 :22.13 77.76.16,17 91:23 107:15 1999 :22.13 1996 :22.13 77.76.16,17 91:23 107:15 20:100 :621 7:12 77.76.12 202 28:93 :11 23 51:0 9:15 13:8 wrong 57:18 1999 :621 157.8 78.14 :12 :17 :12 :22 2000 :621 :17 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :17 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :17 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :22 :2000 :621 :12 :22 :22 :22 :22 :22 :22 :22 :22 :$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			· · · · · ·			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				55 79.0		
				4		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
witness 100.9 wond $31:10$ wond $31:10$ wond $31:10$ wond $31:20$ 97:18 98:11 107:20 97:18 98:11 107:20 97:18 98:11 118:10 54:29 12 14:20 19:24 14:23 48:7 13:18:10 54:24 55:1 34:13 65:2 write $32:16$ 72:25 77:24 50:1 17 105:14 76:15 99:9 63:25 67:21 18 56:15.18 18 56:15.18 99:9 63:25 69:3 99:21.3 99:21.3 99:22.3 199:21.3 199:22.4 123:29 25:23 $18:2050:152.102.15$ $13.8wrote 2.19:20c2.15$ 2.05 $109:252.0000$ $6:217:127:17:21:222.16:16:122.1000:122.1000:6:217:127:17:21:222.100:222.1000:12:20$						
wond 28:11 wond 41:15 92:16 92:41 96:7 wond 31:20 92:91 6 94:8,9 92:91 6 94:8,9 92:92 6 2:11 10:11 10:11 10:11 6 2:4,20 92:13 10:11 6 2:12 92:13 10:11 6 2:12 10:14 6 22:12 10:16 16 22:4,20 10:16 12:4,20 10:16 12:4,20 10	witness's 100:9	,				
	won 28:11	70:23 90:5		···(2) 2.22		
wood 31:15 94:14 96:7 84:5 106:10 5 27:15 32:8 wood 32:313 written 3:20 15 21:4 38:17 6 76:25 77:2.15 7:24 50:1 17 105:14 86:10 10 53:20 99:9 63:25 69:5 17 105:14 53:20 67:10 36:23 words 70:17 73:17 77:4,13 19 56:23 67,000 36:23 7 90:9 63:25 69:5 191 1:23 7 7 76:15 91:9 92:13 1986 2:23 7 74:16:11 53:20 words 27:25 94:8 107:8 1999 12:23 7 74:13 46:10 64:4 7 77:6,16,17 91:23 107:15 1996 62:21 157.8 7 74:12 89:23 work 31:3,22 39:4 25:15 20:10 2:2 7 74:12 89:23 77:20 10:22 20:10 0:22 20:10 0:25 20:00 0:46:8.19 20:00 0:21 1:7:8 74:12 89:23 work 31:3,22 39:4 20:00 0:21 1:7:2 20:00 0:21 1:7:2 20:00 0:21 1:7:2 74:12 89:23 71:12 12:2 20:00 0:22 20:00 0:22 20:00 0:21 1:7:2 20:00 0:21 1:7:2 74:12 89:23 21:16 6:20 23:24	wondering 39:9	92:9,16 94:8,9		5		
	wood 41:15	94:14 96:7		5 27:15 32:8		
			13 18:10 54:24			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			55:1			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			15 21:4 38:17	6		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			17 105:14	6 6:17 46:11		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			18 56:15,18			
wording $76:15$ 91:992:13 words $27:25$ 94:8 107:8 46:2051:13 wrong $55:18$ 1998 $2:421:2168:7 6:622$ 66:39 80:10 77:6;16;17 91:23 107:15 104:4 wrongdoing $15:239:4$ $25:23$ 18:20 5:10 9:15 13:8 words $21:22$ 29:9 $36:171:5$ 23:42 $6:8$ 72:10 76:21 23:42 $6:8$ 72:10 76:21 20:00 $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $46:8;1920:00$ $21:71:271:72:12224:22,222 47:924:22,222 47:923:82$ $6:10$ $1212:18$ $16:2023:82$ $6:10,1212:18$ $16:2023:82$ $6:10,1212:18$ $16:2023:82$ $6:10,1212:18$ $16:2023:82$ $6:10,1212:18$ $16:2020:03$ $5:1220:03$ $5:1220:03$ $5:1220:03$ $5:1220:03$ $5:1220:03$ $5:1220:05$ $5:131:23$ $42:13$ $58:20$ $60:2320:07$ $5:18$ $64:1440:16$ $43:2581:9,14$ $82:2020:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:09$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:120:08$ $5:1:9$ $64:130:394:630:394:630:10$ $95:10$ $21:8$ $82:1420:18:11$ $60:8$			19 56:23			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				7 34:3 46:10 64:4		
104:4 work 3:13,22 $39:4$ $25:23$ 18:20 $50:19$ 15:13:8 $25:23$ 18:20 $50:15$ $5:10$ 9:15 13:8 $16:16$ 22:4,20 $23:4$ 26:8 $72:10$ 76:21 $77:20$ 102:22 worked 3:9,16 $4:11$ 10:11 X 80:22 2000 6:21 7:12 $77:20$ 102:22 $23:8$ 26:10,12 $26:13$ 31:21 $22:38$ 26:10,12 $22:38$ 26:10,12 $22:38$ 26:10,12 $22:38$ 26:10,12 $22:38$ 26:10,12 2002 23:22 2003 51:2 2005 3:1 2005 3:1 2006 6:18 7:13 2007 51:8 64:1,4 $80:20$ 39:12 2007 51:8 64:1,4 $80:20$ 39:23 98:12 $103:15$ 2008 51:9 64:1 2008 51:9 64:1 2003 51:2 98:12 2011 1:1 2003 51:2 98:12 2011 1:1 2003 51:2 98:12 2011 1:1 2003 51:2 98:12 2011 1:1 2003 51:2 98:12 2011 1:1 $81:10$ $95:10$ $95:10$ 2018 82:14 $95:10$ 2018 82:14 $82:14$ 202 88:22 $95:10$ 2011 1:1 218 82:14 22 18:11 60:8			1999 6:21 15:7,8	74:12 89:23		
work $3:13,22$ $5:10 9:15 13.8$ $16:16 22:4,20$ $23:4 26.8$ $33:17 64:18,20$ $77:20 102:22$ worked $3:9,16$ $39:4$ wrote $2:19 20:2$ $23:8 26:10,12$ $25:23 18:20$ $50:15$ $2000 6:21 7:12$ $4:11 10:11$ $12:18 16:20$ $23:8 26:10,12$ \mathbf{X} \mathbf{Y} \mathbf{Y} $26:13 31:21$ \mathbf{Y} <b< th=""><th>, ,</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></b<>	, ,					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
worked $3:9,16$ X $24:22,2247:9$ $4:11\ 10:11$ X $80:22$ $2001\ 35:20$ $12:18\ 16:20$ Y $2002\ 23:22$ $23:8\ 26:10,12$ Y $2003\ 51:2$ $26:13\ 31:21$ yeah $24:14\ 35:6$ $2005\ 3:1$ $42:16\ 43:2,5$ $51:12\ 57:23$ $2006\ 6:18\ 7:13$ $33:12_1\ 62.1$ $58:20\ 60:23$ $21:6\ 46:10$ $50:25\ 57:15$ $61:8,20\ 64:20$ $2007\ 51:8\ 64:1,4$ workers $55:7$ $65:21\ 75:8$ $69:10\ 84:5$ working $4:1,5$ $78:1,6,15$ $89:23\ 98:12$ $5:17\ 8:20\ 17:3$ $79:11\ 80:5$ $103:15$ $19:24\ 20:15$ $81:9,14\ 82:20$ $2008\ 51:9\ 64:1$ $22:9\ 25:25$ $83:10,10\ 88:18$ $95:12\ 98:12$ $31:23\ 42:13$ $88:23\ 89:11,25$ $2011\ 1:1$ $31:23\ 42:13$ $88:23\ 89:11,25$ $2011\ 1:1$ $31:16\ 8:16$ $93:3\ 94:6$ $59:14$ $81:10$ $95:10$ 21 st $82:14$ works $20:6\ 85:22$ year $10:18\ 18:12$ $22\ 18:11\ 60:8$,					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	worked 3:9,16	X				
$12:18 \ 16:20$ Y $2002 \ 23:22$ $23:8 \ 26:10,12$ yeah $24:14 \ 35:6$ $2002 \ 23:22$ $26:13 \ 31:21$ yeah $24:14 \ 35:6$ $2005 \ 3:1$ $42:16 \ 43:2,5$ $51:12 \ 57:23$ $2006 \ 6:18 \ 7:13$ $43:12,16,21$ $58:20 \ 60:23$ $21:6 \ 46:10$ $50:25 \ 57:15$ $61:8,20 \ 64:20$ $2007 \ 51:8 \ 64:1,4$ working $4:1,5$ $78:1,6,15$ $89:23 \ 98:12$ $5:17 \ 8:20 \ 17:3$ $79:11 \ 80:5$ $103:15$ $19:24 \ 20:15$ $81:9,14 \ 82:20$ $2008 \ 51:9 \ 64:1$ $22:9 \ 25:25$ $83:10,10 \ 88:18$ $95:12 \ 98:12$ $31:23 \ 42:13$ $88:23 \ 89:11,25$ $2011 \ 1:1$ $5:17 \ 58:21$ $91:7,10 \ 92:3,7$ $211 \ 15 \ 82:22$ $63:11 \ 68:16$ $93:3 \ 94:6$ $59:14$ $81:10$ $95:10$ $21 \ 82:14$ works $20:6 \ 85:22$ $year \ 10:18 \ 18:12$ $22 \ 18:11 \ 60:8$		X 80:22				
$23:8\ 26:10,12$ Y $2003\ 51:2$ $26:13\ 31:21$ yeah $24:14\ 35:6$ $2005\ 3:1$ $42:16\ 43:2,5$ $51:12\ 57:23$ $2006\ 6:18\ 7:13$ $43:12,16,21$ $58:20\ 60:23$ $21:6\ 46:10$ $50:25\ 57:15$ $61:8,20\ 64:20$ $2007\ 51:8\ 64:1,4$ workers $55:7$ $65:21\ 75:8$ $69:10\ 84:5$ working $4:1,5$ $78:1,6,15$ $89:23\ 98:12$ $5:17\ 8:20\ 17:3$ $79:11\ 80:5$ $103:15$ $19:24\ 20:15$ $81:9,14\ 82:20$ $2008\ 51:9\ 64:1$ $22:9\ 25:25$ $83:10,10\ 88:18$ $95:12\ 98:12$ $31:23\ 42:13$ $88:23\ 89:11,25$ $2011\ 1:1$ $55:17\ 58:21$ $91:7,10\ 92:3,7$ $21\ 1:1\ 58:22$ $63:11\ 68:16$ $93:3\ 94:6$ $59:14$ $81:10$ $95:10$ $21\ st\ 82:14$ works $20:6\ 85:22$ year $10:18\ 18:12$ $22\ 18:11\ 60:8$						
$26:13\ 31:21$ yeah $24:14\ 35:6$ $2005\ 3:1$ $42:16\ 43:2,5$ $51:12\ 57:23$ $2006\ 6:18\ 7:13$ $43:12,16,21$ $58:20\ 60:23$ $21:6\ 46:10$ $50:25\ 57:15$ $61:8,20\ 64:20$ $2007\ 51:8\ 64:1,4$ workers $55:7$ $65:21\ 75:8$ $69:10\ 84:5$ working $4:1,5$ $78:1,6,15$ $89:23\ 98:12$ $5:17\ 8:20\ 17:3$ $79:11\ 80:5$ $103:15$ $19:24\ 20:15$ $81:9,14\ 82:20$ $2008\ 51:9\ 64:1$ $31:23\ 42:13$ $88:23\ 89:11,25$ $2011\ 1:1$ $55:17\ 58:21$ $91:7,10\ 92:3,7$ $21\ 1:1\ 58:22$ $63:11\ 68:16$ $93:3\ 94:6$ $59:14$ $81:10$ $95:10$ $21st\ 82:14$ works $20:6\ 85:22$ year $10:18\ 18:12$ $22\ 18:11\ 60:8$		Y				
$42:16\ 43:2,5$ $51:12\ 57:23$ $2006\ 6:18\ 7:13$ $43:12,16,21$ $58:20\ 60:23$ $21:6\ 46:10$ $50:25\ 57:15$ $61:8,20\ 64:20$ $2007\ 51:8\ 64:1,4$ workers $55:7$ $65:21\ 75:8$ $69:10\ 84:5$ working $4:1,5$ $78:1,6,15$ $89:23\ 98:12$ $5:17\ 8:20\ 17:3$ $79:11\ 80:5$ $103:15$ $19:24\ 20:15$ $81:9,14\ 82:20$ $2008\ 51:9\ 64:1$ $22:9\ 25:25$ $83:10,10\ 88:18$ $95:12\ 98:12$ $31:23\ 42:13$ $88:23\ 89:11,25$ $2011\ 1:1$ $55:17\ 58:21$ $91:7,10\ 92:3,7$ $21\ 1:1\ 58:22$ $63:11\ 68:16$ $93:3\ 94:6$ $59:14$ $81:10$ $95:10$ $21st\ 82:14$ works $20:6\ 85:22$ year $10:18\ 18:12$ $22\ 18:11\ 60:8$						
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	42:16 43:2,5					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	43:12,16,21					
workers $55:7$ $65:21\ 75:8$ $69:10\ 84:5$ working $4:1,5$ $78:1,6,15$ $89:23\ 98:12$ $5:17\ 8:20\ 17:3$ $79:11\ 80:5$ $103:15$ $19:24\ 20:15$ $81:9,14\ 82:20$ $2008\ 51:9\ 64:1$ $22:9\ 25:25$ $83:10,10\ 88:18$ $95:12\ 98:12$ $31:23\ 42:13$ $88:23\ 89:11,25$ $2011\ 1:1$ $55:17\ 58:21$ $91:7,10\ 92:3,7$ $21\ 1:1\ 58:22$ $63:11\ 68:16$ $93:3\ 94:6$ $59:14$ $81:10$ $95:10$ 21 st $82:14$ works $20:6\ 85:22$ year $10:18\ 18:12$ $22\ 18:11\ 60:8$						
working 4:1,5 78:1,6,15 89:23 98:12 5:17 8:20 17:3 79:11 80:5 103:15 19:24 20:15 81:9,14 82:20 2008 51:9 64:1 22:9 25:25 83:10,10 88:18 95:12 98:12 31:23 42:13 88:23 89:11,25 2011 1:1 55:17 58:21 91:7,10 92:3,7 21 1:1 58:22 63:11 68:16 93:3 94:6 59:14 81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8	workers 55:7					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	working 4:1,5					
19:24 20:15 81:9,14 82:20 2008 51:9 64:1 22:9 25:25 83:10,10 88:18 95:12 98:12 31:23 42:13 88:23 89:11,25 2011 1:1 55:17 58:21 91:7,10 92:3,7 21 1:1 58:22 63:11 68:16 93:3 94:6 59:14 81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8						
22:9 25:25 83:10,10 88:18 95:12 98:12 31:23 42:13 88:23 89:11,25 2011 1:1 55:17 58:21 91:7,10 92:3,7 21 1:1 58:22 63:11 68:16 93:3 94:6 59:14 81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8						
31:23 42:13 88:23 89:11,25 2011 1:1 55:17 58:21 91:7,10 92:3,7 21 1:1 58:22 63:11 68:16 93:3 94:6 59:14 81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8						
55:17 58:21 91:7,10 92:3,7 21 1:1 58:22 63:11 68:16 93:3 94:6 59:14 59:14 81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8		· · · · · ·				
63:11 68:16 93:3 94:6 59:14 81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8						
81:10 95:10 21st 82:14 works 20:6 85:22 year 10:18 18:12 22 18:11 60:8		93:3 94:6				
year 10.10 10.12 22 10.11 00.0		95:10				
worid 23:19 28:19 36:6 22nd 13:19		v				
	world 23:19	28:19 36:6	22nd 13:19			
		I		1	I	