

<p>1 Wednesday, 23 November 2011                  2 (10.00 am)                  3 Discussion                  4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Before we start, Mr Barr, Mr Caplan                  5 asked me the other day about a ruling in relation to the                  6 anonymity protocol. I think at some time yesterday we                  7 received yet further submissions from one of the core                  8 participants. Although I have been ready to deliver                  9 a judgment, courtesy requires that I give those                  10 submissions consideration, and therefore I'm afraid that                  11 it will have to be deferred slightly.                  12 MR CAPLAN: Yes my Lord. Sir, I presume the consequence of                  13 that, if any core participant was minded to take it                  14 further, would be that the 14 days will run from the                  15 ruling you next deliver?                  16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I wouldn't necessarily say that,                  17 Mr Caplan, because the ruling that I've given covers the                  18 principle.                  19 MR CAPLAN: Very well.                  20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I can say that I'm not prepared to                  21 revisit the principle, although some of the submissions                  22 have invited me to, so if there had been a challenge to                  23 the principle, I would have expected it to be made.                  24 MR CAPLAN: Yes, I understand.                  25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: As regards the detail as to how we'll</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 "To the paper, the doorstep is routine. Others                  2 might deem it the equivalent of blowing a giant                  3 raspberry at Lord Justice Leveson's Inquiry."                  4 And they gone on to provide an image which I won't                  5 read out because it's slightly unpleasant and slightly                  6 surprising coming from the Guardian.                  7 Of more concern than the factual accuracy is that                  8 suggestion which follows it, and I would like to assure                  9 the Inquiry that the Sun and my instructing clients in                  10 general are taking this Inquiry extremely seriously and,                  11 in case that's not clear as well, with great respect.                  12 That is indeed within my own knowledge.                  13 There is in fact a piece about the Inquiry in the                  14 Sun this morning, and we'd be more than happy to be                  15 judged on that. That's all I wanted to say.                  16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. Thank you very much.                  17 I haven't seen the Guardian this morning. Might I just                  18 have a look at it?                  19 MR DAVIES: Yes, of course. It's the bottom half of the                  20 second column of that article on the front page.                  21 (Handed).                  22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed. (Pause)                  23 All right.                  24 MR DAVIES: That's all I wanted to say, sir.                  25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Does the Guardian want to say</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 proceed, of course somebody can always challenge                  2 a decision of mine, it's perfectly appropriate, and                  3 I don't take it at all personally, but I would expect                  4 that we'd probably need to work out on a case-by-case                  5 basis how it bit in any case. So whether there is                  6 anything sufficiently generic to justify troubling the                  7 Administrative Court will be a matter for you. I'm not                  8 commenting one way or the other.                  9 MR CAPLAN: Thank you very much.                  10 MR DAVIES: I wonder if I might raise something.                  11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, please.                  12 MR DAVIES: I apologise for starting the day with the press                  13 again, but there is a report in the Guardian this                  14 morning on the front page which says that if you want to                  15 know how deeply the self-reproach is running over at                  16 News International, do be advised that the Sun yesterday                  17 sent a reporter to doorstep Ms Patry Hoskins, who is of                  18 course junior counsel to the Tribunal.                  19 It goes on in language I'll come to in a moment, but                  20 first of all can I say that Ms Hoskins has not been                  21 doorstepped by the Sun, and furthermore, that the Sun                  22 did not send anybody to doorstep her, so the article is                  23 inaccurate to that extent.                  24 Of more concern is the inference which is then drawn                  25 by the author in the Guardian to the following effect:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 anything about this?                  2 MS PHILLIPS: The Guardian has only just been made aware                  3 that there's a complaint about it. I don't have any                  4 instructions but I'll see what I can find out and report                  5 back by lunchtime.                  6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, thank you very much. I would                  7 have thought there are enough issues that concern this                  8 Inquiry without descending into the personnel who are                  9 trying their best and working extremely hard to ensure                  10 that they are fair to everyone.                  11 All right. Now you had something else to talk to me                  12 about, Mr Barr?                  13 MR BARR: Yes, sir. Today's witnesses.                  14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.                  15 MR BARR: The order for today will be first of all Mr Mark                  16 Lewis, secondly Mrs Sheryl Gascoigne, thirdly,                  17 Mr Tom Rowland, and then this afternoon, Mr and                  18 Mrs McCann.                  19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or Dr And Dr McCann.                  20 MR BARR: Indeed, I am sorry.                  21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No.                  22 MR BARR: Might I call -- perhaps I should say before I do,                  23 I should address you as to the scope of Mr Lewis's                  24 evidence today.                  25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. I've now seen a supplementary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 witness statement prepared by Mr Lewis dated the day 2 before yesterday, which deals with allegations that have 3 certainly been ventilated widely in the press but which 4 are clearly extremely recent. The supplementary 5 statement deals with them, and clearly raises a number 6 of quite complex issues, not least the extent to which 7 it's appropriate to look at these matters, firstly 8 because of how the information came to Mr Lewis, in 9 other words from the police; secondly, because of 10 serious Article 8 issues; and thirdly, because of the 11 significance that might be attached in the context of 12 the custom, practices and ethics of the press to recent 13 events.</p> <p>14 I understand that there is some more evidence still 15 to come on this topic in the form of another statement. 16 Is that what the Inquiry team understand?</p> <p>17 MR BARR: It's certainly likely to be the case that there is 18 going to be another witness speaking to more or less the 19 same matters, and there may be, I put it no higher than 20 that, there may be some further evidence from Mr Lewis 21 about a separate matter.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Thank you. 23 Mr Sherborne, these are clearly very important 24 issues, not merely in the chronology of the continuing 25 litigation between some of your clients and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 chest, and I could understand that, but there are other 2 issues at play here.</p> <p>3 MR SHERBORNE: Sir, I understand. Clearly this is very 4 important evidence, not just, obviously, for Mr Lewis, 5 but for this Inquiry for the very reasons that you've 6 given, and Mr Lewis understands that. It's evidence 7 which Mr Davies' clients will need to give very serious 8 consideration to. They know about it, but that means 9 also they need time to deal with it. So we understand 10 the approach, sir, that you are taking.</p> <p>11 I'm entirely in your hands as to how you wish to 12 deal with this.</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, that's absolutely right, you 14 are.</p> <p>15 MR SHERBORNE: I recognise that.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.</p> <p>17 MR SHERBORNE: There will be further evidence, sir, as 18 Mr Barr says. There is another witness who will want to 19 come and give their evidence.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that. Of course, that's 21 not decisive, but having regard to the subject matter, 22 I think it's important that all the evidence on the 23 topic is available because this isn't historic.</p> <p>24 MR SHERBORNE: No, it's very fresh indeed.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Let me suggest what I'm</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 News International, but also because they may, and 2 I apprehend that Mr Lewis will suggest that they do, 3 cast light on the very subject matter of the Inquiry.</p> <p>4 MR SHERBORNE: Yes, sir.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If that is so, and I'm minded to 6 think it is, it strikes me that we ought to proceed with 7 a degree of caution, and I'll explain why I say that. 8 These events are still happening. We've not got all the 9 statements in. I assume that Mr Rhodri Davies has seen 10 the statement, but I apprehend that there's 11 a confidential exhibit which he may not have seen, and 12 the question is where that should go and to what extent 13 it could be redacted. It may be that it's a document 14 that won't require a great deal of attention from him 15 for other reasons, although it might be from him, 16 whether it does for his clients, and you know exactly 17 what I mean.</p> <p>18 MR SHERBORNE: Yes, sir.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But given the way in which this 20 Inquiry is being conducted, namely my general ruling 21 that all questions should be asked through the Inquiry 22 team, I am concerned about the extent to which it's 23 appropriate to develop this aspect of Mr Lewis's 24 evidence at this stage.</p> <p>25 I appreciate that he may want to get this off his</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 presently thinking of. I've not heard Mr Rhodri Davies 2 and I'm deliberately doing this without hearing him -- 3 I will in a moment. It's a second limb of evidence 4 which isn't specifically linked into the first, it's 5 because of the chronology. I would wonder whether it's 6 not appropriate to ask Mr Lewis to deal with all that is 7 contained in his original statement now, for which 8 everybody is prepared, I hope, and then review and find 9 some other time to deal with the second statement.</p> <p>10 That's going to require a degree of care because of 11 the Article 8 issues and the extent to which it's 12 appropriate to investigate publicly that which is 13 contained within the document that I have seen. I make 14 it abundantly clear, as I've said to all, that there is 15 absolutely no intention of mine to ventilate or give 16 currency to what is or may be a breach of Article 8 of 17 the Convention.</p> <p>18 MR SHERBORNE: I understand.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So that requires a rather delicate 20 line to be run between what should be available and what 21 should be kept out of the public domain, which won't 22 necessarily mean that it won't be important at least for 23 Mr Davies to see where the lines are being drawn, 24 because as we investigate this issue, I will want to 25 make sure that I am being fair to your client and to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 Mr Lewis and to all the others who might be affected by 2 this evidence, and you will work out who I mean, and 3 I apologise to everybody else for being comparatively 4 cryptic, but equally fair to ensure that 5 News International can put the case on this document 6 that they wish to advance. 7 MR SHERBORNE: Sir, yes. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. 9 MR SHERBORNE: I'm grateful. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you have any observations to that 11 proposed plan of action? 12 MR SHERBORNE: I don't, and neither does Mr Lewis. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I can see that. Thank you very much. 14 MR SHERBORNE: I'm very grateful. 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, Mr Rhodri Davies. Some of 16 this will come as a surprise, perhaps. 17 MR DAVIES: Yes. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you've seen the supplementary 19 statement, so not entirely. 20 MR DAVIES: Yes, indeed. I received the supplemental 21 statement about 4.30 yesterday, without the exhibit. At 22 least some of the documents referred to in it are 23 available within News International, but I haven't had 24 time to read them yet, so I was going to ask you not to 25 deal with that material today because we haven't had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 themselves to the police. 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. Then they only need to know 3 what documents are comprised within it. I'm not ruling 4 on this at the moment. 5 MR SHERBORNE: I understand. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I am going to make one ruling and 7 that is to extend Mr Barr to other members of the 8 Inquiry team, in particular to leading counsel. This 9 has become rather more significant, not in any way 10 diminishing the abilities of Mr Barr, but I think this 11 ought to be seen slightly wider. 12 MR SHERBORNE: I understand that, sir. I'm sure there's no 13 objection to that. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. Right. I think there ought to 15 be a discussion about how to proceed. That can be done 16 outside this room, and outside the inevitable publicity 17 that these hearings tend to command. 18 MR SHERBORNE: Sir, yes. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Right, let's crack on. 20 Yes, Mr Barr. 21 MR BARR: Thank you, sir. Mr Lewis, please. 22 MR MARK LEWIS (affirmed) 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Lewis, I extend exactly the same 24 courtesy to you. It's not different just because you're 25 a solicitor. Please sit down. If you want a break at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 time to get on top of it. 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm just half a step ahead of you. 3 MR DAVIES: You are indeed. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That sometimes happens. Not often, 5 but sometimes. 6 MR DAVIES: Frequently, I'm sure, but I don't think there's 7 anything else which I need say at the moment, so I'm 8 very happy for the Tribunal to proceed in the careful 9 fashion which you have indicated. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Exhibit ML2, 11 Mr Sherborne, is marked: 12 "This exhibit contains intrusive private, 13 confidential and privileged information and is to be 14 disclosed to Lord Justice Leveson and David Barr, 15 counsel to the Inquiry, only." 16 Of course the reason for Mr Barr is because he is 17 going to take Mr Lewis's evidence. 18 Subject to redaction within the confidentiality 19 wall, I would ask Collyer-Bristow to give some thought 20 to extending this. It's quite clear that somewhere 21 within News International this document is -- 22 MR SHERBORNE: Sir, yes -- 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- known about. 24 MR SHERBORNE: The history, as I understand, is that some of 25 the documents were provided by News International</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 any stage, don't hesitate to say so. Thank you for the 2 statement. I appreciate that coming back to have 3 a second bite at the particular cherry may not be what 4 you'd prefer, but I'm sure you understand the reasons 5 for the view that I have formed. 6 A. Yes, sir. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. Right. 8 Questions from MR BARR 9 MR BARR: Mr Lewis, could you tell the Inquiry, please, your 10 full name. 11 A. My full name is Mark Lewis. 12 Q. And you tell us in your statement that your professional 13 address is Taylor Hampton Solicitors, 218 The Strand, 14 London. Is that correct? 15 A. That's correct. 16 Q. You've provided the Inquiry with a first witness 17 statement, which is dated 1 November of this year. 18 I understand that you wish to say something about the 19 last sentence in paragraph 5 of the statement. We can 20 deal with that in due course when we get to it. But 21 subject to that, are the contents of your witness 22 statement true and correct to the best of your knowledge 23 and belief? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. You tell us early in your statement about your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 background. You are now a partner in the firm 2 Taylor Hampton? 3 A. Correct. 4 Q. And you specialise in defamation and privacy law? 5 A. That's correct. 6 Q. You've become known for your phone hacking work? 7 A. Almost too well-known for it. 8 Q. And I should emphasise here that's in the capacity of 9 representing people, not hacking phones. 10 A. Well, sadly it might be both, but certainly for 11 representing people. 12 Q. I'm meaning not hacking phones yourself. 13 A. Well, I haven't hacked phones, but I might be a victim. 14 Q. You've been a witness to the Select Committees -- 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. -- on the issue of phone hacking, and you had conduct of 17 some of the very first civil litigation arising out of 18 the phone hacking issue? 19 A. Yes, that's correct. 20 Q. Can I now take you back a decade to 2001. At that stage 21 it's right, isn't it, that you joined George Davies, 22 a Manchester firm of solicitors, as a partner? 23 A. That's correct, 2 January 2001. 24 Q. At that firm, the work that you did included work for 25 the Professional Footballers' Association?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 A. Correct. 2 Q. "It was suggested even at the time (before anyone knew 3 about the phone hacking scandal) that it was a curious 4 coincidence that the second girl 'D' should have been 5 approached by a journalist." 6 And now the sentence which I think you want to say 7 something about. You continue: 8 "Obviously the journalist could not have told her of 9 Garry Flitcroft's case as that would have involved 10 a breach of an injunction." 11 A. Yes. What -- if I can explain, one, why I said that, 12 and two, why I'm prepared to accept that it needs to be 13 explored further, is initially the case -- the Flitcroft 14 case was known as A, which was Garry Flitcroft, B, which 15 was Sunday People, and C, who was a girl who was 16 a nursery nurse who apparently had sold her story, 17 seemingly voluntarily. 18 Later on in that case, the initial injunction was 19 obtained, an ex parte injunction by Mr Justice Jack was 20 obtained in a case A v B and C. There then followed 21 girl D, who was joined, because one became aware of the 22 willingness of girl D to sell her story. 23 What I was getting at in my statement was this 24 curious coincidence, which we didn't realise at the 25 time, that girl D was also someone who would suddenly</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 A. I would say at that time probably 40 per cent of my work 2 was for the PFA. 3 Q. You amongst other things acted for Mr Garry Flitcroft? 4 A. That's correct. 5 Q. And we heard from Mr Flitcroft yesterday about the 6 litigation which he brought. 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. You tell us in your witness statement, if I might 9 paraphrase it, that you thought that the Court of 10 Appeal's decision in that case is out of kilter with 11 later decisions. Is that a fair summary of your 12 opinion? 13 A. With the greatest of respect, I think the Court of 14 Appeal were wrong at that time. Notwithstanding 15 Lord Justice Leveson. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, no, no, it would be surprising if 17 you didn't, considering you were involved in the case. 18 I'm afraid the court can never please everybody, and 19 rarely pleases anybody. 20 MR BARR: And then you deal with that litigation and the 21 case generally in paragraph 5 of your witness statement, 22 and you say at the bottom of paragraph 5: 23 "Hindsight has led to investigations being commenced 24 as to how this story was obtained." 25 That's the story about Mr Flitcroft, isn't it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 decide to sell her story to the Sunday People at the 2 same time -- it wasn't a published story -- but at the 3 same time as girl C had curiously also picked the 4 Sunday People. The explanation that was offered by the 5 Sunday People at the time was that a journalist 6 unfortunately called Aycock -- because it now strikes me 7 as a cock and bull story -- went to girl D, who she 8 knew, and said a story has been sold about 9 Garry Flitcroft, and wasn't he having a relationship 10 with you? 11 That was not examined, although I have first-hand 12 experience of having dealt with the case, it was the 13 Sunday People, through their lawyers, in-house lawyers, 14 Marcus Partington, were demanding the telephone records 15 at that time. I spent a lot of time, and my ex-wife had 16 to do it, redacting documents to cross out telephone 17 numbers. It now looks as though a further explanation 18 has to be given to the curious coincidence and also 19 because of the journalists who were involved in this 20 story at the time. 21 Q. I see. So that's the point you were intending to make? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Now to the second part, what you actually said: 24 "Obviously the journalist could not have told her of 25 Garry Flitcroft's case as that would have involved</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 a breach of an injunction."                  2 It might be said, mightn't it, that the journalist                  3 must have spoken to woman D before the injunction                  4 because the injunction was to prohibit the publication                  5 of what woman D had said to the journalist? Do you                  6 accept --                  7 A. It's a possible explanation as to what might have                  8 happened, so I accept that.                  9 Q. I see. Thank you. We can move on now to the middle of                  10 the last decade, and there came a point in time, didn't                  11 there, where you represented a lady called                  12 Joanne Armstrong?                  13 A. That's correct.                  14 Q. And you tell us in your witness statement that                  15 Joanne Armstrong was photographed having lunch with                  16 Mr Gordon Taylor?                  17 A. Correct.                  18 Q. And that you took action on her behalf to threaten to                  19 apply for an injunction?                  20 A. That's correct.                  21 Q. To prevent publication of any photograph?                  22 A. The photographer had been confronted at the time and had                  23 indicated that he was taking photographs for the                  24 News of the World. There followed an altercation and                  25 I sent a letter to the News of the World saying, "Do not                  Page 17</p>	<p>1 explanation?                  2 A. It doesn't even have to be investigated. It just wasn't                  3 a proper legitimate investigation. It was a phone had                  4 been hacked in order to get that story. And that would                  5 take you on to the next part. I remember Tom Crone                  6 having said this was proper journalistic inquiries.                  7 I then just happened -- I know we're going further                  8 into -- I just happened to see the news, saw the picture                  9 of Gordon Taylor behind Glenn Mulcaire's having pleaded                  10 guilty to an offence of hacking into Gordon Taylor's                  11 phone, but it was only the royal correspondent that had                  12 been charged from the News of the World. He'd also                  13 pleaded guilty and what had to be done was linking -- as                  14 far as I was concerned, it was a lightbulb moment,                  15 a eureka moment, that's how he got that story, because                  16 the story just wasn't true. If the story would have had                  17 a modicum of truth, something like that would have made                  18 sense, but there was no truth in the story at all.                  19 Actually it was quite a sad story because                  20 Joanne Armstrong's father had died and she'd left                  21 a message for Gordon Taylor saying -- because Gordon had                  22 spoken at the funeral and because her father had died,                  23 she hadn't been comfortable enough to speak to him, she                  24 was naturally very upset on the day, and the next day                  25 she left a message for him saying, "Thank you for                  Page 19</p>
<p>1 publish -- we act for Joanne Armstrong, do not publish                  2 a story about her, she is a private individual against                  3 whom you have no right to publish her story, and also it                  4 seems that the story you're intending to publish just                  5 isn't true."                  6 Q. I see, and the photograph was not published. The                  7 explanation, you tell us, was provided by Mr Tom Crone,                  8 the lawyer at the time for the News of the World, who                  9 said that they wouldn't publish but that the story had                  10 been obtained through proper journalistic inquiries. Is                  11 that what he told you?                  12 A. That's correct. That was sent in a letter. The                  13 explanation for that was because not only had                  14 I requested that the story didn't get published, but I'd                  15 also asked for my costs and some damages, and the                  16 rejection of my claim or my client's claim for costs and                  17 damages was because this was a proper journalistic                  18 inquiry and therefore they said, or Tom Crone had said,                  19 "You're not entitled to costs or damages".                  20 Q. A detailed investigation of this issue may properly be                  21 a subject for part 2 of this Inquiry, but the question                  22 which you raise, if I am paraphrasing it correctly, is                  23 that in the light of what we now know about phone                  24 hacking, that you question whether or not the                  25 explanation you were given was a full and proper                  Page 18</p>	<p>1 yesterday, you were wonderful."                  2 The tabloid journalist who knew of that message                  3 added 2 and 2 and made 84. They couldn't possibly                  4 conceive of any other explanation. If it wouldn't have                  5 been so sad, it would have been funny.                  6 Q. If I just stop you there. So that is the position as                  7 you believe it to be, and as I mention, I think that                  8 might have to be a matter properly for part 2 of the                  9 Inquiry, but if I can pick up on your mention of the                  10 convictions of Glenn Mulcaire and Clive Goodman, it was                  11 at that stage, wasn't it, as you say, that you had                  12 a eureka moment, and one of the victims was                  13 Mr Gordon Taylor.                  14 Is it right that as a result of learning about the                  15 convictions, that Mr Taylor took advice from you and                  16 from counsel?                  17 A. My firm had been acting for the PFA for probably 50                  18 years. We had a standing retainer, and therefore                  19 I reported back to say, look, I think I know where they                  20 got the Gordon Taylor story from, and therefore I also                  21 think that there is a civil claim that will follow from                  22 it, whether invasion of privacy or now in the vernacular                  23 it's known as phone hacking, but to say they obtained                  24 this story through an illegal or unlawful source.                  25 Q. I see, so it came to pass, didn't it, that Mr Taylor                  Page 20</p>

<p>1 initiated a claim against News Group News?                  2 A. Yes.                  3 Q. And he in due course commenced proceedings?                  4 A. Just to correct you, he commenced a case against                  5 News Group Newspaper and against Glenn Mulcaire,                  6 secondly.                  7 Q. The result of commencing those proceedings was that                  8 whilst denying liability, the News of the World wanted                  9 to talk to you?                  10 A. Yes. Initially the letter before action was virtually                  11 ignored, and then proceedings were issued and that's --                  12 after the proceedings were issued, they wanted to have                  13 a conversation.                  14 Q. You tell us in your statement that Julian Pike,                  15 a partner in the firm Farrer &amp; Co, acting for News Group                  16 News, suggested that Mr Crone come to see you about the                  17 matter. Is that correct?                  18 A. That's correct.                  19 Q. Did that surprise you?                  20 A. It was, one, a surprise, but it was also a very big                  21 give-away because I'd been acting for the PFA and before                  22 that I'd been acting for other people through other                  23 associations with sportspeople, et cetera, and Tom Crone                  24 had never been to see me, he'd never come to Manchester,                  25 and all of a sudden -- I mean, the whole thing could</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 did you think it was worth £250,000?                  2 A. On a breach of privacy basis, if there was -- it wasn't                  3 a published story. If there had have been a Part 36                  4 offer, and Part 36, you understand --                  5 Q. We'll come to that.                  6 A. If there had been a Part 36 offer of £20,000, I'd have                  7 had no alternative but to advise my client to accept it                  8 because the risk would have been so high.                  9 Q. And then you tell us that what happens is that                  10 News International -- I won't use that precise legal                  11 title, but everyone understands who I mean --                  12 News International served a defence?                  13 A. Yes, that's correct.                  14 Q. And that denied liability?                  15 A. It not only denied liability, but it was served                  16 expressly without prejudice to our application to strike                  17 out the -- because our case was based on an inference                  18 that this was an unlawful activity, et cetera. There                  19 was no -- we didn't have the smoking gun that would say,                  20 "This is what you've definitely done", there were just                  21 lots of inferences and we had to build up an inferential                  22 case to sort of get over the threshold of the balance of                  23 probabilities.                  24 Q. An inferential case to connect Glenn Mulcaire to the                  25 News of the World?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 have been dealt with, if one analysed it properly, one                  2 would have said "This is a privacy claim, we make no                  3 admissions without prejudice, et cetera, here's £10,000,                  4 now go away."                  5 But the fact he was coming to see me suggested that                  6 they had something to hide.                  7 Q. You tell us in your statement that you were asked how                  8 much Mr Taylor would accept to settle the case?                  9 A. Yes.                  10 Q. And you put the figure of £250,000 to him; is that                  11 right?                  12 A. That's correct.                  13 Q. What was his reaction?                  14 A. He just got up and left. He just -- instead of making                  15 any -- the £250,000 offer that I made was really to                  16 initiate a negotiation, saying we'll set this high.                  17 Lawyers are always told not to horse trade, but I was                  18 planning to horse trade. He just got up and left and                  19 went back to London. I think he was in my office for 10                  20 or 15 minutes, exchanged a few pleasantries, probably                  21 thought it was easier because I started off by agreeing                  22 with him, sort of led him into a false sense of                  23 security, and then he just upped and left.                  24 Q. In terms of what you thought the case might be worth if                  25 Mr Taylor had pursued it to trial and been successful,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 A. The starting point was that Clive Goodman was the royal                  2 correspondent. Gordon Taylor wasn't King Gordon, so                  3 therefore somebody else at the News of the World would                  4 have been instructing Glenn Mulcaire if they had                  5 instructed.                  6 Q. I understand. And for those who -- well, perhaps                  7 I could ask you this. Who signed the statement of                  8 truth?                  9 A. It was signed by Julian Pike. That became relevant                  10 later on, I'm sure you're going there, because it was an                  11 amended defence that was served and I specifically asked                  12 that a member of their client signed the statement of                  13 truth rather than a solicitor from Farrers. It was                  14 refused as a request.                  15 Q. And then you tell us in your statement that various                  16 applications were made by Mr Taylor for the disclosure                  17 of documents from various parties, from the Metropolitan                  18 Police and the Information Commissioner and from the                  19 Crown Prosecution Service?                  20 A. That's correct. And actually the case had gone quiet as                  21 far as Farrers were concerned. I'm sure they thought                  22 that it had all gone away and nothing was happening and                  23 we'd started a case with some bluster and then done                  24 nothing, but we were seeking nonparty disclosure from                  25 people.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 Q. You tell us in your statement about a conversation which 2 occurred outside court with a Mr Maberly of the 3 Metropolitan Police and your recollection of the 4 conversation is: 5 "You are not having everything, but we will give you 6 enough to hang them." 7 And said there were something like 6,000 victims? 8 A. That's correct. What had happened was we were applying 9 for disclosure from the Metropolitan Police because at 10 that time it was known that there were a handful, 10 or 11 12 victims of phone hacking, so the application for 12 nonparty disclosure had asked for everything that the 13 Metropolitan Police had. And it was in that context we 14 went before the Master at the hearing and the Master -- 15 the submissions were made on behalf of the police 16 saying, "Look ..." 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Lewis, for the lawyers present 18 this is fascinating, and I understand its relevance and 19 it is contained in your statement, but I think for those 20 concerned about the particular issues that I have to 21 solve, it's perhaps not quite as significant. 22 MR BARR: We can deal with it in this way, can't we, 23 Mr Lewis: the conversation that you had outside court 24 with Mr Maberly is the subject of a dispute? 25 A. It is the subject of a dispute.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 A. Subsequently -- 2 Q. I don't mind here about when you knew, but -- 3 A. Subsequently, he was working for a newspaper which at 4 that time belonged to the Associated Group. 5 6 Q. If we resume the course of Mr Taylor's litigation, you 7 provided the "for Neville" email, amongst other 8 documents, to News International's News Group News' 9 solicitors, didn't you? Did that have an effect on the 10 course of the negotiations? 11 A. That's when the negotiations started. After -- it was 12 one of those occasions where you actually do have the 13 smoking gun and you can say to somebody, "Look, this is 14 the information", and it was odd because the position 15 had gone from a denial to an admission, effectively, to 16 show what is happening, and they wanted to negotiate. 17 Q. You tell us that they made a £50,000 offer using 18 a procedure known as Part 36. For those people who are 19 listening who are not lawyers, I'd like to ask you 20 a little bit about Part 36. In broad terms, what are 21 the consequences of turning down an offer made under 22 Part 36 and then going on to recover less than, in this 23 case, £50,000, at trial? 24 A. Less than or equal to. So what it meant was that if -- 25 the explanation I would have given to Gordon Taylor, and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 Q. And that is ongoing and it's not a matter that we need 2 to go into in any more detail. What is more important 3 is the result of your various disclosure efforts was 4 that you received, didn't you, an email which has become 5 known as the "for Neville" email? 6 A. That's correct. It wasn't known as the "for Neville" 7 email at the time, it was the "we've got them" email. 8 Q. Indeed. And the significance of that email was that it 9 made the causal link that you were looking for and very 10 significantly increased the strength of Mr Taylor's 11 claim? 12 A. It undermined the credibility of the denial that News 13 had put forward. 14 Q. You also tell us that you received a compact disc which 15 had the recording of a conversation between 16 Glenn Mulcaire and a person who we're not going to name 17 in these proceedings, but the gist of what the 18 conversation was was that Mr Mulcaire was teaching this 19 person how to hack a mobile phone. 20 A. Correct. 21 Q. And without naming the person, who was that person 22 working for, to the best of your knowledge? 23 A. Well, at that time what was important was at that time 24 I didn't know. 25 Q. I don't mind --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 the explanation I gave to my clients, it might be that 2 I worked too long in the world of football, was to say 3 that whilst you can't move the goalposts, in litigation 4 you can move the goalposts, so that if there is 5 a Part 36 offer of, say, £50,000, if you get £50,000 or 6 less awarded to you at trial, then you will end up 7 having to pay the other side's costs, even though you've 8 won, from 21 days after the date, and your own costs. 9 So the effect is that whilst you might have won £50,000, 10 the costs in legal cases are triangular, they start from 11 a small point and broaden out, that the victory would be 12 that you might get £50,000 damages and get landed with 13 a bill for £500,000, so the other side would take great 14 credit from winning. 15 Q. You told the Inquiry not long ago that if you'd received 16 a Part 36 offer for £20,000 early on in the litigation, 17 you would have advised your client to take it? 18 A. (Nods head). 19 Q. You now get a Part 36 offer for £50,000 but your client 20 didn't take it, did he? 21 A. No. 22 Q. Why not? 23 A. They were too busy negotiating before we had time to 24 reject offers. 25 Q. When you say negotiating, you mean offering you even</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 more money?</p> <p>2 A. Farrers were in a spin. The News of the World had been</p> <p>3 caught out, the £50,000 quickly went up, 100, it just</p> <p>4 seemed such a flurry of activity from them that</p> <p>5 culminated in a conversation between Julian Pike and</p> <p>6 myself where they offered £250,000. He said, "All</p> <p>7 right, you can have the figure that you asked for</p> <p>8 initially, £250,000", and I had a smile on my face,</p> <p>9 although it was over the telephone, to say, "No, that</p> <p>10 was before the case had started. Now we've got this</p> <p>11 evidence, we didn't have the evidence then", and they</p> <p>12 carried on negotiating.</p> <p>13 Q. Ultimately, the settlement figure was?</p> <p>14 A. £425,000.</p> <p>15 Q. That's £425,000 for damages?</p> <p>16 A. For damages, plus costs. Now, the costs --</p> <p>17 Q. Can we come to the costs in a moment? Just before we go</p> <p>18 there, I'd like to ask you about a particular</p> <p>19 conversation that you mention at paragraph 25 of your</p> <p>20 witness statement, where you say that Mr Pike told you</p> <p>21 that you were "negotiating with Murdoch". Did he tell</p> <p>22 you which Murdoch?</p> <p>23 A. No, I had no idea which one. I thought he meant</p> <p>24 Rupert Murdoch because he only used the surname.</p> <p>25 Q. Can you remember when this conversation took place?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 or not it went any further as to -- I couldn't give</p> <p>2 evidence as to what James Murdoch or Rupert Murdoch knew</p> <p>3 at the time.</p> <p>4 Q. If I just stop you there because I diverted you from the</p> <p>5 question of costs. So as well as paying £425,000, the</p> <p>6 settlement involved News Group News paying Mr Taylor's</p> <p>7 legal costs; that's right, isn't it?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Can I --</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think we need to go into</p> <p>11 this. Normally your costs are assessed and they get</p> <p>12 knocked down to what the assessor, the costs judge,</p> <p>13 considers are reasonable, but here you got every penny?</p> <p>14 A. Every single penny.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, thank you.</p> <p>16 MR BARR: You tell us that after the case you got a call</p> <p>17 from Mr Pike.</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. And he said that Mr Crone wanted to meet you and you say</p> <p>20 that you went to meet Mr Crone and a friend of his at El</p> <p>21 Vino wine bar in Fleet Street?</p> <p>22 A. Correct. They asked me when I was next in London, they</p> <p>23 would like to take me for lunch, or he would like --</p> <p>24 Julian -- it was said at the time that Julian Pike and</p> <p>25 Tom Crone would like to meet me for lunch. He then</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 A. I couldn't tell you the specific date, but around the</p> <p>2 time just before the case had settled.</p> <p>3 Q. Perhaps when you return to give evidence, you'll be able</p> <p>4 to confirm exactly when you say that conversation took</p> <p>5 place.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. How sure are you that Mr Pike used the words</p> <p>8 "negotiating with Murdoch"?</p> <p>9 A. 100 per cent sure.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you mean a direct quote, "negotiating with Murdoch",</p> <p>11 or something to that effect?</p> <p>12 A. Sorry --</p> <p>13 Q. Are you saying that "negotiating with Murdoch" is</p> <p>14 a direct quote? It's in quotations in your witness</p> <p>15 statement.</p> <p>16 A. Sorry, 100 per cent sure that he made the comment "with</p> <p>17 Murdoch". Whether it was "negotiating" or "dealing with</p> <p>18 Murdoch", he said "with Murdoch". We had that</p> <p>19 conversation. In hindsight, people are looking at it as</p> <p>20 though Julian Pike and I are arch enemies, but at the</p> <p>21 time we were talking on a friendly basis and it had gone</p> <p>22 so high in terms of negotiations that he was saying,</p> <p>23 "You're negotiating, you're dealing with Murdoch".</p> <p>24 Obviously I wasn't face to face with any Murdoch,</p> <p>25 otherwise I'd have known which one it was, and whether</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 apologised that he wasn't able make it, so it was</p> <p>2 Tom Crone and a friend of his.</p> <p>3 Q. And so you go to the meeting and you went on for a meal</p> <p>4 afterwards, and you tell us that you told him at that</p> <p>5 stage that you were going to be acting for two further</p> <p>6 phone hacking victims?</p> <p>7 A. Basically the atmosphere was convivial, and then the</p> <p>8 colleague friend had left and then it was Tom Crone and</p> <p>9 myself and I said, "I have two other cases for you".</p> <p>10 Q. Is it right then that after that, the approach of</p> <p>11 News Group News to you was that they thought it was not</p> <p>12 proper for you to act for any more phone hacking</p> <p>13 victims?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. There has been a dispute as to who was at that</p> <p>15 lunch, whether Julian Pike was there. He wasn't there.</p> <p>16 Tom Crone has now disputed it, so I do know the person</p> <p>17 he was with. He also suggested we were downstairs at</p> <p>18 a bar having a drink. If anybody knows me, I can't</p> <p>19 remember the last time I had a drink. I'm not teetotal,</p> <p>20 but I forget to drink alcohol.</p> <p>21 Q. That's not what I was asking, I was asking you about</p> <p>22 News Group News' position --</p> <p>23 A. That's what happened. Then News Group -- Julian Pike</p> <p>24 phoned me, I remember where I was, we had open plan</p> <p>25 offices but had breakout rooms and I'd gone into a room</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>



<p>1 to have a telephone conversation and Julian Pike told 2 me, "You can't act". 3 Q. And the ultimate culmination of that was a complaint was 4 made against you to the Solicitors Regulation 5 Authority -- 6 A. No, sorry. I did act -- sorry, take it in stages. 7 Those two actions, one was for Joanne Armstrong, who I'd 8 acted for initially, and one was for a third person 9 who's never been named -- 10 Q. I -- 11 A. -- but there was no complaint, the -- 12 Q. I know that it came some time later, and that you have 13 continued to act for phone hacking claimants -- 14 A. Sorry, but there wasn't a complaint at all -- 15 Q. Not at that time. 16 A. Sorry, there was a complaint over the telephone, it was 17 dealt with over the telephone, I said I could act, they 18 then agreed that I could act and I did act and I settled 19 case two and case three. 20 Q. But I'm asking you about much further down the line. Is 21 it right that ultimately a complaint was made against 22 you to the Solicitors Regulation Authority about the 23 issue of whether it's right for you to act for phone 24 hacking victims? 25 A. But not by FARRERS or NEWS.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 lawyer to act for me. 2 Q. At the time the story broke, you were still working in 3 Manchester? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. And did the fact that you were attracting phone hacking 6 clients cause difficulties for you at the partnership in 7 Manchester? 8 A. Well, I was actually on holiday and I never went back to 9 my firm. I was away, I got phone calls that said that 10 this had come up. I ended up flying back to -- I had 11 just got to Israel, I was on holiday in Israel, and 12 I was there for two days, came home to England, came to 13 London and went to see Max Clifford, and then 14 I telephoned my managing partner, Mark Hovell, on the 15 Sunday, and said, "I've just been instructed as a joint 16 instruction with another lawyer for Max Clifford", and 17 his reaction was to swear and say, "Oh, this is 18 a disaster", a matter that you have to take up with him. 19 But what had happened is after the story had come 20 out in the Guardian, Gordon Taylor had been on the phone 21 to me many times and I remember having conversations 22 with him on the Friday and on the -- the Friday evening 23 just near a bank, I was getting money out of a cash 24 machine to come back home, to look at it because of the 25 ramifications for him because of this story breaking.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 Q. Indeed. 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Who was that complaint made by? 4 A. That was by Gordon Taylor. Gordon Taylor had said that 5 I had entered into an agreement with him that I wouldn't 6 act for anybody else, sort of ever, on anything to do 7 with anything that he'd had to do with. It was 8 something that had never been discussed with 9 Gordon Taylor, I would never have agreed to this idea 10 that somehow -- it was a bit like acting for a driver in 11 a personal injury claim and then agreeing that you would 12 never act for any of the passengers on his bus. 13 Q. The ultimate outcome of the complaint was? 14 A. It was rejected in its entirety. 15 Q. Can we now move to 2009. The Guardian break the story 16 about hacking and you tell us in your statement, if 17 I paraphrase, that the result of that was that you 18 started to get a lot more phone hacking clients? 19 A. Initially I was approached by one or two people, because 20 initially the five people who had been named in the 21 criminal prosecution were Gordon Taylor, Max Clifford, 22 Sky Andrews, Simon Hughes MP and Elle Macpherson, so 23 Max Clifford was the first one who had been on 24 Newsnight -- I had been away -- saying this is terrible, 25 I'm going to bring a claim. I want Gordon Taylor's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 Q. Indeed. I'm looking now at paragraph 34 of your witness 2 statement, Mr Lewis. Is it right that the upshot was 3 that you were expelled from the partnership in 4 Manchester? 5 A. It was, but we had two provisions in the partnership 6 deed, one to be expelled as a good leaver, and one not 7 to be expelled as a good leaver. The good leaver 8 provision was to have expulsion without any reason, so 9 even though you'd done nothing -- even though I'd done 10 nothing wrong, the partners were able to expel me and 11 they chose to do so. 12 Q. You describe that graphically at paragraph 34 if I may 13 pick it up: 14 "After that meeting I called my managing partner, 15 Mark Hovell. Rather than being pleased, he said that he 16 did not want me to act. I said that I wanted to do this 17 for me and my partners but if not I would do it on my 18 own. He responded that he would call me the next day 19 (13 July 2009). At 10 am that day I received an 20 ultimatum on my 'BlackBerry' to the effect that unless 21 by 11 am I gave an undertaking ..." 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Barr, I don't think we need to 23 read this. The statement is available, everybody can 24 read it, and although it may be a consequence of some of 25 the work that Mr Lewis has done, it isn't at the very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 core of what I'm concerned with.</p> <p>2 MR BARR: I will move on then, sir, to over the page where</p> <p>3 you tell us that you've given evidence to the Select</p> <p>4 Committees and you tell us of the differences of opinion</p> <p>5 that have arisen between you and the police and</p> <p>6 Baroness Buscombe and the PCC. I don't need to dwell on</p> <p>7 that in any detail, that's all set out in your</p> <p>8 statement.</p> <p>9 And then you tell us more recently, under the</p> <p>10 heading "Further phone hacking developments" --</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just before you get there, here is</p> <p>12 something that I think it's just worth asking Mr Lewis</p> <p>13 to cope with. That is the reaction of the PCC to the</p> <p>14 concerns that were being expressed, and that is</p> <p>15 identified in your statement, and did itself lead to</p> <p>16 libel proceedings and had other consequences that are</p> <p>17 set out in your statement, which may be relevant when</p> <p>18 one considers the PCC. It may be you're going to come</p> <p>19 back to that.</p> <p>20 MR BARR: Yes, sir.</p> <p>21 You tell us about further developments, how you</p> <p>22 picked up practice in London and have acted for phone</p> <p>23 hacking victims here in London since then.</p> <p>24 Moving to the question of the proceedings you</p> <p>25 brought against, amongst others, the PCC, it is right,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 saying, "It is a very serious matter to mislead</p> <p>2 a Parliamentary Inquiry", and then grinned.</p> <p>3 Q. So it was that that led to you taking proceedings?</p> <p>4 A. It wasn't exactly the grin but it did help.</p> <p>5 Q. I see. Can I move to the question of the reaction of</p> <p>6 Associated News when you've been dealing with them, and</p> <p>7 I'm looking now at paragraph 49 of your witness</p> <p>8 statement. What has been the position of</p> <p>9 Associated News?</p> <p>10 A. I received a telephone call from Liz Hartley, who is the</p> <p>11 in-house solicitor or one of the in-house solicitors at</p> <p>12 Associated News. I'd dealt with her before when she was</p> <p>13 in private practice on a completely unrelated matter</p> <p>14 for -- she was acting for another newspaper and I was</p> <p>15 acting for an individual, and certainly I think it was</p> <p>16 about 6 o'clock or something, I picked up my -- my</p> <p>17 direct line was ringing and she said effectively, "You</p> <p>18 remember me", and then I was told that, you know,</p> <p>19 Paul Dacre wouldn't hesitate to sue me if I suggested</p> <p>20 that the Daily Mail was involved in phone hacking.</p> <p>21 Q. Was that in relation to a specific case or was that</p> <p>22 a general warning?</p> <p>23 A. I think that was -- that was supposed to be a general</p> <p>24 warning. It related to a conversation I'd had with</p> <p>25 a journalist when I said that phone hacking wasn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 isn't it, that those led to a public statement being</p> <p>2 made by the PCC?</p> <p>3 A. The public statement on behalf of the PCC and on behalf</p> <p>4 of Baroness Buscombe, who are second and third</p> <p>5 defendants in libel proceedings I brought.</p> <p>6 Q. Perhaps you could tell us in a nutshell what you</p> <p>7 considered was the problem with the PCC's approach to</p> <p>8 matters?</p> <p>9 A. Baroness Buscombe was the guest speaker that year at the</p> <p>10 Society of Editors' annual dinner at their conference in</p> <p>11 2009 and she delivered a speech very much like -- it's</p> <p>12 still available on the Internet -- very much like</p> <p>13 Neville Chamberlain: I have in my hand almost a piece of</p> <p>14 paper -- there was a clue -- what I needed to do, and</p> <p>15 some emails to confirm it, which is the modern take on</p> <p>16 Chamberlain, effectively talking -- you've heard</p> <p>17 evidence about this conversation between</p> <p>18 Detective Sergeant Maberly and he then was and someone</p> <p>19 else, it was me, and basically we've heard from</p> <p>20 Assistant Commissioner John Yates and that the truthful</p> <p>21 evidence was that which was given by John Yates,</p> <p>22 effectively saying that I was a liar.</p> <p>23 She went on to finish her speech by saying I've done</p> <p>24 two things. I've reported this to John Whittingdale, so</p> <p>25 that they can correct records, and then finished by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 simply related to one newspaper. In a way, I feel sorry</p> <p>2 for the News of the World, or certainly the</p> <p>3 News of the World's readers, because it was a much more</p> <p>4 widespread practice than just one newspaper. It was</p> <p>5 just simply that their inquiry agent, Glenn Mulcaire,</p> <p>6 had written things down and kept the evidence. The fact</p> <p>7 that evidence doesn't exist in written form doesn't mean</p> <p>8 to say that the crime didn't happen.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But is that your supposition, your</p> <p>10 evidence-based conclusion? What is that?</p> <p>11 A. Well, it's evidence-based conclusions on the basis --</p> <p>12 certainly on a civil basis of what I'm being told by</p> <p>13 clients and taking instructions from them as to whether</p> <p>14 or not stories are written that could not have got to</p> <p>15 newspapers in any other way.</p> <p>16 I think it's important to understand the whole</p> <p>17 nature of phone hacking, just as a sort of side issue,</p> <p>18 because people still have this misconception that</p> <p>19 a journalist could not have got the whole story from</p> <p>20 phone hacking and therefore didn't get the story from</p> <p>21 phone hacking. Phone hacking might only give two or</p> <p>22 three parts of the jigsaw, but it might suggest that</p> <p>23 such-and-such a person will be at such an address, or</p> <p>24 such-and-such a person is speaking to somebody else, so</p> <p>25 the journalist then knows which address to go to, or who</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 they're speaking to or who they're having a relationship 2 with, or maybe even luckier, that they find a specific 3 quote of something.</p> <p>4 And what phone hacking -- voicemail -- simply remote 5 voicemail interception, what it enabled people to do was 6 just to pry on things. It was too easy to do. I mean, 7 journalists found it too easy to do, and therefore 8 I don't think they necessarily thought of it as any 9 worse, certainly at the beginning, than driving at 35 10 miles an hour in a 30 mile an hour zone.</p> <p>11 MR BARR: I understand your answer, but does that mean you 12 can't tell the Inquiry of any hard evidence?</p> <p>13 A. It depends what is meant by hard evidence. People who 14 have provided information have said these are the 15 inferences. It's a question that I suppose until the 16 judge has decided that something is accepted, it's only 17 evidence and sometimes it might be inferential.</p> <p>18 Q. I see. Can we move now to the treatment of you by the 19 Daily Mail, an Associated News title, in the press. I'm 20 looking at paragraph 57 of your statement. You tell us 21 that Amanda Platell has written about you in her column 22 in the Daily Mail on two occasions and you tell us that 23 the coverage is included describing you as having 24 a "sanctimonious face on the BBC"?</p> <p>25 A. I didn't know whether she meant my face was only</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 said, "Look, that's just not true", and they called me 2 back about ten minutes later and said, "It's been taken 3 off our website".</p> <p>4 Q. Moving now to the News of the World and their treatment 5 of you, I'm now looking at paragraph 56 of your 6 statement, you tell us that you repeatedly called for 7 Rebekah Brooks to resign, and we know that she 8 eventually did do that. You say that during the time 9 you were calling for her resignation, you were: 10 "... warned by a newspaper source that Rebekah had 11 said she would get me back not in her newspaper (which 12 would be too obvious) but in a competitor."</p> <p>13 You've mentioned the adverse coverage in the 14 Daily Mail. Did that come after you were told of this 15 comment or before?</p> <p>16 A. I think that came after. There was a -- there were 17 a number of things that happened after that. I never 18 chose to be a public figure. I suddenly became a -- 19 I acted for people who were the story, and suddenly 20 became part of the story myself. All of a sudden I got 21 approached by various newspapers that they were running 22 stories about this aspect of my private life or that 23 aspect of my private life, and I think the second Amanda 24 Platell one was certainly after the conversation. I'm 25 not sure if the first one just preceded slightly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 sanctimonious when it was on the BBC or generally and 2 she just didn't like the BBC, but I suppose she couldn't 3 help herself but to put to the two -- to have an 4 anti-BBC jibe in there as well.</p> <p>5 Q. And you were accused, weren't you, of being a "greedy 6 lawyer" in relation to the Dowler settlement?</p> <p>7 A. Absolutely. Actually, what happened, I telephoned -- 8 after I found that out, I telephoned Dan Tench who is 9 a solicitor at Olswangs who was acting for News 10 International, who were negotiating the Dowler, or had 11 negotiated the Dowler settlement with me, to say, look, 12 the Daily Mail is writing an untrue article because the 13 gist of the article was that although £3 million had 14 been offered by News Group, the greedy lawyer, me, was 15 asking for more money, and that just wasn't true. It 16 wasn't true.</p> <p>17 The reason it wasn't being put out was because 18 there were i's to dot and t's to cross in the agreement 19 and the timing of the public announcement was in the 20 hands of News International to put out. But because of 21 that, Amanda Platell just took it on herself to do a bit 22 of lawyer bashing.</p> <p>23 Q. And the result, you tell us, of taking issue was the 24 story was taken down?</p> <p>25 A. When I telephoned the night lawyer at the Daily Mail and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 Q. Do you know of any evidence which links the threat that 2 Rebekah would get you back to that coverage or not?</p> <p>3 A. No. I have no direct -- no direct knowledge. I do know 4 Amanda Platell was, I think, the editor of the failed 5 newspaper Today, and therefore there would be reason to 6 think that she might have had some knowledge or 7 association with Rebekah Brooks.</p> <p>8 Q. Your statement touches upon the issue of surveillance, 9 but I'm not going to deal with that today for the 10 reasons which were discussed at the outset of the 11 hearing.</p> <p>12 Is there anything that you would like to say to 13 Lord Justice Leveson at this stage about what you would 14 like to see happen to regulation of the press as 15 a result of this Inquiry?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I suppose there is. And it almost echos what 17 Lord Justice Leveson was saying at the start of this 18 Inquiry, because what is portrayed is a stark choice, 19 a black and white choice between state regulation and 20 self-regulation, and in fact everybody knows that we 21 must avoid state regulation in terms of this Trotskyite, 22 Stalinist, Nazi minister of propaganda that says 23 newspapers can --</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That covers a fair amount of 25 political geography.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

<p>1 A. Yes, I was going to add Middle Eastern despots as well,                  2 but there you go. One understands that that has to be                  3 avoided, but that's how state regulation is portrayed by                  4 the newspapers, that's what it inexorably leads to, we                  5 have state regulation as state control.                  6 Yet they talk about self-regulation. If you stop                  7 and think, self-regulation should be what journalists do                  8 and newspapers do themselves, not the PCC or any third                  9 party, because there ought to be a code that journalists                  10 think: you know what? This is what we can do, this is                  11 what we can't do. So it's a secondary form of                  12 regulation.                  13 The Press Complaints Commission, in the words of                  14 Lord Hunt, who is now the Chairman of the Press                  15 Complaints Commission, is not a regulator, so in fact                  16 the preservation of the status quo by the press is the                  17 preservation of no regulation at all. And the                  18 consequence of no regulation is that on Sunday, people                  19 will not be able to read the News of the World because                  20 it was the absence of regulation that allowed this                  21 Inquiry to happen, it allowed the News of the World to                  22 go, it allowed the readers of the News of the World --                  23 I mean, whether one agreed with everything they put in                  24 and wanted to take issue, it was an absolute consequence                  25 because parts of the newspaper industry, not all the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Lewis, this is obviously something                  2 you've thought about. And your experience acting in                  3 these cases will obviously give you a particular                  4 perspective. But there must be a balance between                  5 freedom of expression and privacy, which is what you've                  6 talked about earlier on in your evidence. Where do you                  7 say that balance should be?                  8 A. Well, I think it was rather helpful that I was almost                  9 a defendants' lawyer, so I acted for the British                  10 cardiologist Peter Wilmshurst who is being sued by the                  11 American company. I acted for the Sheffield Wednesday                  12 fans who were subject to libel bullying by their club.                  13 Acting on CFAs for them, defending their right to speak                  14 out. I've acted as advocate in the Court of Appeal for                  15 Adakini Ntuli who sought the right to speak out,                  16 effectively a story telling about her relationship.                  17 There's always going to be a balance and there are                  18 always going to be difficult cases where that balance is                  19 harder to see, but if you suggested that actually what                  20 was happening was -- the same facts can give rise to                  21 different legal situations. So, for example, if you                  22 have the David Mellor situation with Antonia de Sancha,                  23 where it's exposing that you have a minister who is                  24 engaged in something while he's part of a government                  25 which is espousing family values, really what you're</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 newspaper industry, were completely unregulated and out                  2 of control.                  3 They were happy enough -- people talk about --                  4 journalists talk about freedom of the press, but it's                  5 not really freedom of the press that they want. They                  6 want freedom to be able to do what they like. You know,                  7 none of us have total freedom. We have to drive at                  8 certain speeds, we have to obey certain rules, we can't                  9 go around murdering people, we can't go around stealing                  10 from people, and the press seem to -- a certain sector                  11 of the press seem to believe that they could do whatever                  12 they like, almost as if they were above the law.                  13 And what they do is characterise that any attack on                  14 that is actually an attack on the freedom of the press                  15 so that what we have as good journalism, which exposes                  16 corruption, a fourth estate exposing corruption in                  17 Parliament, the MPs' expenses scandal, or going back,                  18 exposing thalidomide or in America exposing Watergate,                  19 good journalism, or even sort of more minor but                  20 interesting things, should get brushed away into the                  21 fact that now you said we're not allowed to break the                  22 law, we can't do any of this. Terrible.                  23 MR BARR: Thank you. I don't have any more questions for                  24 you.                  25 Questions from LORD JUSTICE LEVESON</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 doing is exposing his hypocrisy, albeit that some of the                  2 more popular newspapers might be more salacious in their                  3 details and talk about a Chelsea football strip that he                  4 was allegedly wearing, although I understand he wasn't                  5 actually wearing it, but it was a good story -- is                  6 different, I would say, than, say, a proper footballer                  7 who has no public persona. You heard Garry Flitcroft                  8 yesterday, no public persona at all, had never made any                  9 expression to people about what was right or what was                  10 wrong. There is no reason for that to go out.                  11 I suppose that if you were to apply metaphoric                  12 curtains over something, those things that happen behind                  13 curtains shouldn't be pried into unless there's a very                  14 good reason to do so.                  15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But some of the things which have                  16 been exposed by the good work of the press have indeed                  17 taken place behind curtains.                  18 A. Well, they would come under the very good reason to do                  19 so.                  20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And that leads on to another                  21 question. I appreciate that you make your living using                  22 the courts and the law, but as everybody has made very                  23 clear, that's extremely expensive, very time-consuming,                  24 takes a lot of mental energy as well as physical energy.                  25 Have you thought about some alternative mechanism? And</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 if so, where are you going to get the paragon of virtue 2 who is going to be able to decide those cases? 3 A. Well, I mean I have thought of it. Look, I have the 4 advantage of being a Manchester lawyer rather than 5 a London lawyer, and therefore -- and possibly not as 6 snobbish about the fact that libel cases or privacy 7 cases can only be decided in courts 13 and 14 in the 8 Queen's Bench Division. 9 There is an oddity that reputation cases are always 10 assigned to the multi-track, whereas any other -- if 11 a van that was delivering a newspaper ran you over and 12 caused you £10,000 of damages, you might pursue that in 13 Manchester County Court if it was in Manchester, or 14 wherever. If they defamed you in a small way or invaded 15 your privacy in a small way, I actually don't see 16 a reason why you couldn't want to pursue that claim in 17 the Manchester County Court, and that would lead to 18 a lowering of costs. 19 There is a perception, which is right in some 20 respects, that it's only the lawyers who win out of 21 cases because the costs are completely disproportionate 22 to the amount awarded in damages. 23 There are all sorts of claims that ought to be dealt 24 with. I don't think it has to move out of the system. 25 I think the court system has to be more accessible. And Page 49</p>	<p>1 difficulty is that the present system gives this 2 high-option thing that says, well, if you want to sue 3 for -- you know, if you want to sue for an invasion 4 of privacy, you have to be prepared to spend £500,000 or 5 £600,000, you will only recover £400,000 in costs and 6 you might recover damages of £100,000, so in order to 7 protect your privacy, you only have to lose £100,000. 8 The fact that anybody can say "You only have to lose 9 £100,000 in order to win a case" shows that the system 10 is not working and it's out of kilter. 11 One of the ways to deal with that, obviously as 12 a lawyer, is raise the damages and then people wouldn't 13 lose. But the claimants approach things from 14 a different perspective. If they are defamed, or if 15 their privacy has been infringed, they want it to be 16 corrected. And ultimately, the position is that they 17 need to be able to take action. 18 You see, again it's difficult when your Lordship, 19 when you're talking about regulation of the press, the 20 regulation of the press will only go so far because it 21 can only deal with what is printed. It doesn't deal 22 with what is not printed. So people will always have 23 a need for lawyers and the law ought to be accessible to 24 everybody, not just the -- when I was an undergraduate, 25 libel law was regarded as something for the rich. Now Page 51</p>
<p>1 one of the big issues is really access to justice. You 2 know, we have a political move at the moment to abolish 3 CFAs in insurance. It might be that the base costs are 4 too high because of the work that has to be involved, 5 but simply abolishing conditional fee agreements and the 6 ability to have insurance, ultimately it leads to people 7 not being able to bring cases at all, and people need to 8 be able to -- you know, it goes back to the McLibel 9 case, the jurisprudence in Strasbourg, the judgment in 10 the European Court, talked about the equality of arms -- 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that might mean that one should 12 find some other mechanism to mediate some of these 13 claims without using the structures of the court. 14 A. Well, in every field of law, apart from reputation, 15 although even with -- I have mediated libel claims not 16 between newspapers, between -- I was acting for the 17 defendant for the National Health Service litigation 18 authority for a defamation claim, I was acting for 19 a defendant for a defamation claim brought by a doctor. 20 There was a mediation. I think the total costs on each 21 side was a four-figure sum. The claimant was persuaded 22 that he would drop his claim and the defendant agreed to 23 publish some sort of correction rather than apology as 24 to what had happened. 25 The formalisation of being able to do that -- the Page 50</p>	<p>1 it's for the very rich, or people who can get CFAs. And 2 the idea that we will then abolish -- we haven't 3 abolished CFAs, but we're in the process of abolishing 4 insurance -- 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I understand the arguments about 6 CFAs and I understand the cost of litigation. What 7 I was really asking about was other mechanisms for the 8 resolution of these disputes, speedily, effectively, and 9 without the expense that is presently being incurred, 10 and you've given us -- 11 A. I think I would just add the difficulty is this, as you 12 will see from this Inquiry. The difficulty is always 13 going to be that there is then an inequality. So that 14 if, for example, one of the national newspapers says 15 something about your client, your client decides that 16 he'll take this cheap option and represent himself, 17 there is nothing to stop the newspaper instructing 18 leading counsel to represent them, then it becomes an 19 inequality -- 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It depends whether it follows the 21 adversarial model that we're all so used to. 22 A. No, I understand that, but then what happens inevitably 23 will be that there will be judicial reviews, et cetera, 24 and diversions into litigation that beat the claimant 25 up. I mean, the claimant -- see, one of the ways to Page 52</p>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

<p>1 avoid the huge cost of, say, defamation litigation would 2 be for the press not to defame people. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 4 A. The way to avoid invasion of privacy is not to invade 5 their privacy. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that, Mr Lewis, but 7 there has to be a balance, hasn't there, because there 8 are always going to be difficult cases. There are 9 always going to be issues of where the line is drawn, 10 and I recognise the problem. One way of utterly 11 undermining and doing away with the need for complex 12 personal injury road traffic litigation is for people 13 not to have accidents, but that's not what happens in 14 life. 15 So I understand the ultimate aim, but I also 16 recognise that in pursuing what may be very important 17 stories, there are judgments to be made and there has to 18 be a mechanism whereby the judgment that is made by the 19 journalist or the press can be challenged, but that 20 doesn't mean that there hasn't got to be a judgment made 21 in the first place. And if you always default and never 22 do anything that is even the remotest bit risky, then 23 you potentially get into -- 24 A. No, I understand that, but -- I pursue libel reform, I'm 25 a member of the Libel Reform Coalition because of people</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 matters that arise from this. Two are very brief 2 reputational matters concerning Ms Elizabeth Hartley and 3 Amanda Platell. I'm happy during the adjournment to 4 give the questions which I would respectfully ask that 5 Mr Barr puts to Mr Lewis. If not, I would wish to make 6 an application to you under Rule 10. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think the first thing is you should 8 have the chance to speak to Mr Barr. 9 MR CAPLAN: Thank you. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And see whether we can do that. 11 MR CAPLAN: Thank you. 12 MR DAVIES: I'm afraid I have a similar point and I'll do 13 the same thing. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do the same thing, we'll have five 15 minutes now -- 16 MR CAPLAN: Can I mention one other matter which doesn't 17 relate to questions? 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 19 MR CAPLAN: It's simply this, that Mr Lewis mentioned in his 20 evidence that he had been given a copy of a CD in which 21 Glenn Mulcaire was coaching a Mr X, whose identity has 22 not been made public, in relation to how to hack 23 a mobile phone and Mr Lewis said that that individual 24 was an employee at the time of Associated Newspapers. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 like Peter Wilmschurst who stand up to libel bullies and 2 need to be represented. Now, there is a system where 3 people should be able to defend claims that are brought 4 against them, otherwise you have the chilling effect, as 5 it's known, but it can have the reverse chilling effect 6 if people can't afford to advance a claim to stop 7 something that's being said about them. 8 Sometimes litigation is the only way forward and it 9 has to be pursued. 10 Of course, any alternative dispute resolution 11 schemes that work are to be welcomed, and if ADR can get 12 rid of 90 per cent of the claims -- it requires 13 a willingness on both sides of the fence. You know, the 14 newspapers -- for example, they talk about, oh, those 15 greedy lawyers, they pursue claims on a CFA and they're 16 looking for this 100 per cent uplift. If after a claim 17 is made to them they admit it because the merits support 18 their admission, then no 100 per cent uplift will ever 19 be awarded on a detailed assessment. The costs will be 20 a lot lower. Sometimes the newspapers fight and are 21 entitled to fight on a matter of principle, but as are 22 the claimants, and that's why we have courts. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I understand that. Thank you. 24 Thank you very much. 25 MR CAPLAN: I'm so sorry, but I'm afraid there are a few</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 MR CAPLAN: Can I just say I think at the time he was an 2 employee of the Evening Standard and I think the 3 allegation is that he was being -- 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Caplan, I understand the point. 5 I am very keen to make sure that (a) the evidence is 6 accurate, but (b) that nothing is done to create a risk 7 of the type of which, if you consider it for a moment, 8 you will readily appreciate. Could I ask you to just 9 have a word. 10 MR CAPLAN: I will. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And let's find a mechanism to deal 12 with this issue that is appropriate and doesn't run any 13 risks. 14 MR CAPLAN: Indeed. It's just whether his name is in the 15 public domain and whether or not the Tribunal sees it 16 fit to release it. It's just that if there is a slur on 17 other employees -- 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that, I understand that 19 I think the five minutes is going to be very well spent 20 this morning. 21 (11.30 am) 22 (A short break)) 23 (11.41 am) 24 Further questions from MR BARR 25 MR BARR: The short adjournment was very useful and as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 a result of it I think it's proper that I put a couple 2 of short questions to Mr Lewis. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. 4 MR BARR: Mr Lewis, first of all can I take you back to 5 paragraph 49 of your witness statement, which deals with 6 the conversation you had with Liz Hartley about the 7 statement to the effect that Paul Dacre was someone who 8 would sue you. Was the tone of that conversation 9 friendly or not? 10 A. Businesslike, I would describe it as. I certainly took 11 it as an attempted warning and that's why I made a file 12 note of it. If it would have just been a funny 13 chit-chat "be careful", I wouldn't have been bothered to 14 do that. That's why I have the date of the 15 conversation. 16 Q. I have been provided during the short adjournment with 17 a copy of an article which I shall in a moment pass to 18 you. It was published in the Daily Mail on 4 February 19 2006. Once you've had an opportunity to have a look at 20 it, the question that I would like you to answer is: was 21 this conversation to do specifically with this article? 22 (Handed) 23 A. That was -- I can see from the headline it was a part to 24 do with that, and that's what I explained before. I'd 25 been having a conversation saying that Associated was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 Rebekah Brooks, Amanda Platell and the publication of -- 2 A. Sorry, I didn't offer any direct evidence that either 3 linked them or linked that evidence. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I didn't read the evidence as 5 suggesting that. 6 MR BARR: That was my understanding as well, Mr Lewis, but 7 thank you for confirming that. 8 Sir, those are the questions that as a result of the 9 short adjournment I wanted to ask but I should also say 10 that I've had a word with Mr Davies, and he would like 11 to not ask questions, but he would like to say 12 something, and it may be that that's the best way of 13 dealing with this. 14 MR DAVIES: Yes. I had a discussion with Mr Barr, and the 15 conclusion was that it was probably better if I said 16 something rather than try to do it through questions, 17 but if you disagree, sir, then -- 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Until I know what you're going to 19 say, I can't tell you whether I agree or disagree. Say 20 it and I'll tell you. 21 MR DAVIES: I will carry on. As a matter of background, I'm 22 afraid it raises a further difficulty about redactions 23 and indeed about the speed with which things are going 24 on to the Inquiry's website. It concerns paragraph 23 25 of Mr Lewis's statement. Mr Barr did ask some questions</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 involved. That was not the only case, but it was one of 2 the cases in the conversation with that particular 3 journalist. 4 Q. And so that we are clear, was the statement that 5 "Paul Dacre is someone who will sue you if you suggest 6 that we were involved in hacking" a statement that was 7 related to that article or was it of more general 8 application? 9 A. I took it as more general, but that was certainly the 10 background. But ultimately, I'm the lawyer acting for 11 an individual who's instructed me, the subject matter of 12 that article. He'd instructed me to pursue it. I am 13 not -- I hadn't been aware, previously, of the idea that 14 what you do is you'd have a go at attacking the lawyer 15 rather than the client. Call me old-fashioned. 16 Q. Can I move on to the second point that I would like to 17 raise with you. It arises from paragraphs 56 and 57 of 18 your statement. This is the paragraph that deals with 19 the suggestion that Rebekah Brooks had said that she 20 would get back at you, but in a different newspaper, and 21 subsequent coverage in the Daily Mail. You described 22 the coverage already. 23 I'm told that there might be some lack of clarity on 24 the transcript. Just so that we are clear, do you have 25 any evidence that there is a link between</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 about this. What paragraph 23 says, and it's referring 2 back to a statement in paragraph 21 -- 3 MR GARNHAM: (overspeaking). 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just pause, Mr Davies. 5 MR DAVIES: Yes. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There are issues. 7 MR DAVIES: There are, and I'm going to be careful. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand the issues. I'm on top 9 of the issues. I will cope with them. 10 MR DAVIES: Yes. 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But I would prefer it if this 12 particular exchange was redacted from the transcript. 13 MR DAVIES: The one we're about to have? 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The one we're not about to have. 15 MR DAVIES: Ah, I see. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And the one we've started. I would 17 be grateful if you would talk, please, to Mr Jay about 18 this over the short adjournment and we will see if we 19 can't resolve it. 20 MR DAVIES: Yes, sir. Sorry, it's a little difficult for me 21 to respond to that. Can I just mention this? Some of 22 what I'm concerned about is already spreading through 23 what I might call the new media, so to a certain extent 24 time is of the essence and I know there are difficulties 25 about --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. What I'm going to do is let 2 you speak now. 3 MR DAVIES: I hope I'm not going to tread anywhere 4 I shouldn't. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'll ask Mr Jay just to have a quick 6 word with you. I'll stay in court. Just have a quick 7 word. (Pause) 8 MR JAY: First of all, I've been asked to say that the 9 witness statement may be best removed from the screen. 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 11 MR JAY: Secondly, I think we can proceed with the next 12 witness and I can have a conversation certainly with 13 Mr Rhodri Davies. I don't know if the next witness 14 concerns his clients at all. If she does, we may have 15 to rethink. It may be I have to involve two other 16 people in that conversation. 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Well, Mr Rhodri Davies, 18 are you concerned to be present to hear the next 19 witness? 20 MR DAVIES: No, I'm content to step out for a moment. 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. We'll carry on and if 22 necessary we'll revisit it. 23 This actually alerts us to a risk of which I've 24 always been aware and which we've tried to manage, and 25 we might have to get rather cleverer about how we manage</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 preparing your statement and giving up the time to come 2 and give evidence. Thank you. 3 Questions by MS PATRY HOSKINS 4 MS PATRY HOSKINS: Good morning. Could you please state 5 your full name to the Inquiry. 6 A. Sheryl Gascoigne. 7 Q. Now you provided a witness statement to this Inquiry, 8 which hopefully you have in front of you. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. We can see that on the screen at URN30982. Oh, it's 11 already there. 12 Before I ask you any questions about your statement, 13 can you just confirm that the contents of it are true to 14 the best of your knowledge and belief? 15 A. Absolutely. 16 Q. I am going to ask you a few questions first of all about 17 your background, if I can. I'm sure that you need no 18 introduction and you yourself put it succinctly at 19 paragraph 3 of your statement: 20 "To the general public, I am the ex-wife of 21 Paul Gascoigne, the retired English footballer." 22 You explain at paragraph 4 in relation to that 23 relationship that Paul and yourself met in 1990, you 24 began a relationship in the summer of 1991, you married 25 in 1996, you divorced in 1998, you have a son together,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 it. 2 MR DAVIES: Yes. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So we'll carry on with the next 4 witness and you can resolve this and we'll decide how 5 we're going to deal with it. 6 Thank you very much, Mr Lewis. 7 THE WITNESS: Might I just ask one thing, that I'm not in 8 purdah until the next time I give evidence? 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, you're not. Good criminal law 10 experience. 11 Yes. 12 MS PATRY HOSKINS: Sir, the next witness is Sheryl 13 Gascoigne, so if I could ask her to come up. 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. 15 MS SHERYL GASCOIGNE (sworn) 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mrs Gascoigne, you've probably heard 17 me say to others that I'm very grateful to you and to 18 them for coming. You're volunteers. You're going to 19 talk about things which are personal to you and which by 20 definition are matters which you've been concerned to 21 keep away from the public eye, so I understand how 22 difficult that is, but it is important for the purposes 23 of the Inquiry that we try to get to the bottom of 24 what's happening and where, therefore, we should go, if 25 we go anywhere, so I'm very grateful to you for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 who was born in 1996, and you have two children from 2 a previous relationship, Bianca and Mason. That's all 3 correct? 4 A. (Nods head). 5 Q. It's also very well documented, Mrs Gascoigne, that you 6 were the victim of domestic violence during the course 7 of your relationship with Paul. Indeed, you've 8 published a book, which I'll hold up, this one, which is 9 called Stronger, which in the introduction indicates 10 that the book is written not to lift the lid, so to 11 speak, on Paul Gascoigne or your time with him, really, 12 but is written for other victims of domestic violence. 13 Is that right? 14 A. Yes, it is, yeah. 15 Q. Could you tell us a little bit about the work that you 16 do, the charity work you do in respect of domestic 17 violence issues? 18 A. My work with a domestic violence charity, mainly Refuge, 19 started back in 1998, 1999. I was involved with them 20 before that, they were helping me, but then I was asked 21 to head a campaign that they were running in the Sun, 22 and that was 1999. 23 Q. Have you continued to work with Refuge? 24 A. Yes, I worked with them all the time and I -- 25 Q. You still do that work now?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>



<p>1 A. Yes, I'm still a huge supporter and help them out where 2 I can. I've also been involved with the Metropolitan 3 Police, they've asked me to come and give talks on, you 4 know, hopefully how they can change and move forward to 5 helping victims. 6 Q. Thank you. I'm going to turn to press conduct whilst 7 you were in the relationship with Mr Gascoigne. You say 8 at paragraph 5 of your statement, for those who have it, 9 that as soon as you started your relationship with Paul 10 in 1991, you and your children's lives were thrust into 11 the public eye and your lives have now been scrutinised 12 over a period of some 17 years and that still continues 13 now? 14 A. Yes, it's not as bad as it was back then, obviously, but 15 yes, no, that's true. 16 Q. Just for the moment, I'm going to concentrate on the 17 time when you were with Paul, if I can. You say 18 yourself in your statement that the focus of the press 19 was clearly mainly on Paul, he was the subject of the 20 interest? 21 A. Mm. 22 Q. He was a very famous footballer, obviously, but they 23 were interested in his private life, which means by 24 definition they were interested in you; is that right? 25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 win, so you just don't do it. 2 Q. Who told you that? 3 A. Paul's advisers. 4 Q. Right. So you didn't take action during that time? 5 A. No, no. 6 Q. Can we look at some of the articles. They're in your 7 exhibits, which you should find slightly further on in 8 the bundle. For the benefit of the technician -- 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do we need to put some of these 10 things up? 11 MS PATRY HOSKINS: Maybe I should ask Ms Gascoigne that 12 question. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. 14 MS PATRY HOSKINS: You've put them in your exhibits. Would 15 you rather that we didn't go through them again? 16 A. I don't mind. If it helps the Inquiry, then ask me. 17 Q. You made allegations that they contain untruthful and 18 hurtful allegations, and I only wanted to ask you so 19 that you would have the chance to comment on any 20 allegations that you found to be particularly untruthful 21 or hurtful. Is there anything that you would like to 22 draw to the Inquiry's attention? 23 A. It's just generally the fact that, you know, I was only 24 with him for the money. Are you just talking about the 25 early days before the marriage or --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 Q. And you explain at paragraph 10, which you should find 2 just over the page, that right from the beginning, you 3 felt that the press latched onto the idea that you were 4 some kind of money grabber who was at the heart of 5 Paul's problems. I'll go through some of the articles 6 that were written about you during that time in 7 a moment, but why do you think they alighted on this 8 issue as being representative of who you are or who you 9 were? 10 A. I don't know. You'd have to ask them. I have no idea 11 why they would say that because you're in 12 a relationship. Maybe because I was a single mother 13 with two children, maybe it was just an easy -- I was an 14 easy target. 15 Q. So what was the reality of your relationship with Paul? 16 A. I was very much in love with Paul. 17 Q. At paragraph 11 of your statement, just further down the 18 page, you explain that until 2010, so for some 19 years, 19 you decided not to respond to the articles at all. You 20 explain that you didn't firstly feel in a position to do 21 so, and you thought it might have made things worse. In 22 what way do you think that taking action at that stage 23 might have made things worse? 24 A. I was led to believe that -- by certain people that, you 25 know, you didn't take action on newspapers, you'd never</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 Q. No, the entire period that you were with him. 2 A. Yeah, that I only married him to get his money, and that 3 when we divorced, that, you know, the reports I got 4 millions, ranging from 10 to 17, sometimes it was only 5 8, but, you know, the reality was far, far from that. 6 So yeah, so that's just kind of what I've become 7 accustomed to being known as. 8 Q. Is your complaint that much of what was said was 9 untruthful or inaccurate? 10 A. Yes, untrue -- 11 Q. And hurtful to you? 12 A. Obviously hurtful to me and my children, but yes, 13 inaccurate and untrue. 14 Q. And you actually tell us in your statement, of course, 15 that one of the things you found most difficult was the 16 sheer failure to check facts with you. Can you tell us 17 about that. Did they ever contact you to check facts 18 before an article was published? 19 A. Rarely, rarely. But if they did and you didn't -- 20 you're very conscious that if you said something, you 21 know, some simple question, you said "yes" or "no", it 22 then became a headline that you have actually said the 23 question that they've said, "Oh, look, she says" ... 24 I don't know, "she hasn't seen" -- they say have you 25 been in contact with Paul and you say no, the headline</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

<p>1 would be oh, she's had not -- he's not been anywhere                  2 near, she's had no contact with him. It's almost like                  3 you said that so you ended up saying nothing at all and                  4 the old cliché, "I have no comment".                  5 Q. Would it be your case that in most cases they would fail                  6 to contact you or --                  7 A. Yeah, no, most cases, especially in the ones that I took                  8 the libel action on more recently.                  9 Q. So still dealing with this period, this period when you                  10 were with Paul, you tell us in your witness statement,                  11 paragraph 13, that you did have one experience of making                  12 a complaint to the Press Complaints Commission, the PCC?                  13 A. Yeah.                  14 Q. You say you can't remember in relation to which article                  15 it was, but can you tell us a little bit about your                  16 experience of making that complaint?                  17 A. I didn't know that the PCC existed, I didn't know what                  18 it was, and I was introduced to Guy Black when I --                  19 I can't remember his position, but he was with the PCC                  20 and I was -- someone brought my attention to it. So the                  21 next time I felt really aggrieved by something, I took                  22 it up with them and they just -- you know, it just                  23 didn't go anywhere. It was just like, "We can't do                  24 anything about it", so I kind of got that opinion from                  25 a lot of people, that the PCC was a waste of time,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 a neighbour said some comment about loving the holiday                  2 pics, so I was just embarrassed, obviously. But again                  3 I was told there was nothing we could do about it.                  4 Q. You also say at paragraph 23 just over the page that                  5 whilst you were in a relationship with Paul, the press                  6 photographers followed your every movement?                  7 A. Yeah.                  8 Q. In particular you say freelance photographers used to                  9 camp outside the house and follow you by car whenever                  10 you left the house.                  11 A. Mm-hm.                  12 Q. "It got so bad that I used to try and lose the                  13 photographers by driving round roundabouts several times                  14 or by driving into a housing estate so as to lose them."                  15 The dates you indicate there are 1991 to 1998. Is                  16 that the period when it was particularly bad or is that                  17 the only period when that kind of behaviour was                  18 occurring?                  19 A. No, that's when it was particularly bad, obviously.                  20 Q. You explain that you did report this to the police but                  21 were told that they couldn't take much action?                  22 A. I drove into the police station with one following me,                  23 and all the time I was getting out the car I was                  24 thinking what am I doing? They're going to have                  25 a picture of me outside the police station. What story</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 really.                  2 Q. Can you remember, even though you can't remember what                  3 article it relates to --                  4 A. No, I can't.                  5 Q. -- can you remember roughly what time period that                  6 relates to?                  7 A. It would have been pre my wedding. It was pre-1996.                  8 And obviously when Mr Black was still there. I don't                  9 know how long he -- he was there, or --                  10 Q. Okay. That's helpful. It's not just the articles that                  11 you refer to, of course, in your statement as being                  12 relevant. It's also other types of press misconduct so                  13 I'm going to ask you about that. You'll find your                  14 statement deals with this at paragraph 22 onwards if we                  15 turn back in the bundle. You take us through a number                  16 of examples of conduct that you consider to be                  17 unacceptable and intrusive and the first one is at                  18 paragraph 22. You say -- well, over the years you find                  19 that the press has a blatant disregard for privacy. One                  20 example that sticks in your mind is in 1995 when the                  21 press took pictures of you sunbathing topless on                  22 a private beach whilst you were on holiday with Paul.                  23 What was your reaction to finding out that they had done                  24 that?                  25 A. I obviously didn't know about it until I got back and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 are they going to make up about the fact I'm in a police                  2 station? But I was almost about to give birth then and                  3 I said to them "Something bad is going to happen here".                  4 Q. You were pregnant?                  5 A. Yes. At that time they were following me constantly,                  6 there was no let up. I think they were waiting for me                  7 to hopefully give birth on a pavement or something but                  8 I drove straight into a police station, said please you                  9 have to do something, I'm taking risks, he's taking                  10 risks, something's going to happen and I was told                  11 there's nothing we can do unless he touches you.                  12 Q. Okay. You say this, though. You say:                  13 "I did notice a slight change after Princess Diana's                  14 death in 1997."                  15 What do you mean by a "slight change" and how long                  16 did that last?                  17 A. I think there was some ruling, I'm sure you all know                  18 better than me, that they weren't allowed to follow you                  19 as much or sit outside or come that close to your                  20 vehicle if they were following you, or something like                  21 that, so definitely it helped. I used to have them                  22 outside the house, you know, where we lived at the time,                  23 the children -- I lived -- they could just stand right                  24 outside the front lawn and there was nothing I could do                  25 about it. I mean, after the incident in 1996 at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 Gleneagles, I was crawling around on my hands and knees, 2 with my arm in a sling, just to avoid the photographers. 3 And I again called the police and asked them to -- just 4 asked them -- and they said, "There's nothing we can do, 5 it's a public land". 6 Q. So you were crawling around on your hands and knees so 7 they couldn't take pictures of you through the window? 8 A. Yeah, I'd bought a show home and the curtains didn't 9 close, so I couldn't actually close the curtains 10 downstairs in the lounge. 11 Q. I'm still dealing with the time when you were in 12 a relationship with Paul, but you do say at paragraph 24 13 that this kind of intrusion hasn't been limited to that 14 period. You say that fairly recently a photographer 15 followed you in your car all the way to a shopping 16 centre and he stopped following you only after you 17 questioned what he was doing. How recently was that? 18 A. That's a couple of years ago, yeah, so not in the last 19 few months. A couple of years ago. 20 Q. I'm reminding you again that we're still dealing with 21 the time when you were with Paul. I've been asked to 22 ask you a number of questions, and the first one is 23 obviously you got married to Paul in 1996 and it has 24 been widely reported that you sold the rights to the 25 pictures of your wedding to Hello magazine.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 MS PATRY HOSKINS: What was the impact -- we've talked about 2 the articles that were published, we've talked about the 3 cars that were following you, we've talked about people 4 trying to take pictures through the front windows of 5 your house. What was the impact on your children at the 6 time? 7 A. It was tough for them because we lived on a small 8 housing estate in a cul de sac where they were able to 9 go out, the elder two, obviously, and play, and it was 10 such that I would have to try and say to them, "Please 11 don't go out today, there's lots out there", so that was 12 unfair on them. And other times when I needed to go 13 out, they would say, "Right, mum, you go and we'll kind 14 of ride our bikes so that they can't all then follow 15 you". So, you know, not a great position for them. And 16 it was tough on them at school, especially my daughter, 17 being the eldest. 18 Q. Can you tell me about that? Why was it tough on them at 19 school? 20 A. Because people -- parents -- I'm sure the children don't 21 particularly read that many newspapers at that age, but 22 parents do and things are said, and so, you know, 23 children are told things and maybe say things that -- 24 you know, the children at school, and unfortunately for 25 them, how our life was being portrayed was obviously</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. That's right? 3 A. Yes, yes, correct, yeah. 4 Q. Some might say that by selling an intimate private event 5 like a wedding means that you are basically putting your 6 private life out there, that you invite and/or condone 7 media interest in you. Do you have any views on that? 8 A. I agree to an extent of that, but our lives -- it was 9 out of my hands anyway, but I'm not saying I wouldn't 10 have agreed to do it, it was organised by Paul's 11 advisers, but our life was already in the public eye 12 anyway, so. 13 Q. I understand. I've also been asked to put to you that 14 you gave interviews to the News of the World in 2001 and 15 2002 and were paid money for that. Is that correct? 16 A. You'd have to show me. I don't know -- what ones are 17 they? 18 Q. I struggled to find them. We'll find them. 19 A. No, I don't know. 20 Q. Perhaps the relevant party will provide -- 21 A. What, Paul or me? 22 Q. Despite extensive searching this morning, I was unable 23 to find them. Perhaps we can ask the relevant party to 24 provide them, if they wish to do so. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 very different to how it was, and how -- for them how 2 Paul was being portrayed was very different to how he 3 was becoming. 4 Q. What about the impact on you? How did you feel about 5 the articles, being followed around at that time? 6 A. I always used to just say to the children, "We know the 7 truth, the people around us know us, know the truth", 8 and just to hold our head up high. 9 Q. I am now going to turn to the period since 2009. By 10 2009, you've been divorced for 11 years, and yet you say 11 the media coverage of you continued? 12 A. Mm-hm. 13 Q. Why, in your view, did it continue long after you 14 divorced and presumably also, on some occasions, some 15 time after you'd stopped being in a relationship with 16 Paul? Do you have any views on that? 17 A. I think maybe people were obviously giving stories, 18 inaccurate and untrue stories, so they are happy to 19 print it. 20 Q. I've been asked to ask you again about your book, 21 Stronger. It's been said that during this time -- it 22 could be said that by doing this, by publishing a book, 23 you were putting your private life into the public 24 domain again and that's what attracted the new sort of 25 media attention again.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Is that right?</p> <p>3 A. Before -- no, not just because of the book. It's been</p> <p>4 ongoing throughout, so I don't think the book -- it was</p> <p>5 my way of being able to -- it was my right to reply on</p> <p>6 I think it was Paul's third book, so the children and</p> <p>7 I felt enough was enough and it was time to put our --</p> <p>8 I was going to say our side, but it's hard to say our</p> <p>9 side when it's the truth.</p> <p>10 Q. I've also been asked to ask you about appearing in the</p> <p>11 television programme I'm a Celebrity ... Get Me Out of</p> <p>12 Here. Could that have fuelled the interest in you as</p> <p>13 well?</p> <p>14 A. As I said, the interest was still there.</p> <p>15 Q. Why did you decide to take part in that television</p> <p>16 programme?</p> <p>17 A. Because the children were very much behind it, and</p> <p>18 I don't do everything my children tell me but I am very</p> <p>19 much led by them, and the offer amount was large and, as</p> <p>20 my son rightly said, you know, that's a large amount of</p> <p>21 money for three weeks' work, and it was a chance for</p> <p>22 everyone to get you to know you as you, rather than the</p> <p>23 person that everyone's been led to believe you are.</p> <p>24 Q. But at about this time, 2009, when the book was</p> <p>25 published, you know that a number of articles were</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 take?</p> <p>2 A. I just thought I need to do something and I was already</p> <p>3 with Clintons, my lawyers, and they had all the factual</p> <p>4 evidence there, so it just made sense to go to them and</p> <p>5 say, look, I need to do something about it, you know</p> <p>6 it's not true, you have it all here, can we do something</p> <p>7 about it? So I was introduced to Roddy, my libel</p> <p>8 lawyer, and the rest, as they say, is history.</p> <p>9 Q. At that stage, did you ever consider making a complaint</p> <p>10 to the PCC or engaging with the PCC in any way?</p> <p>11 A. No. Because, I mean, my experience previously and it's</p> <p>12 kind of common knowledge if you're in the public eye,</p> <p>13 what are the PCC going to do about it? Absolutely</p> <p>14 nothing.</p> <p>15 Q. At paragraph 16 of your statement, you give us a list of</p> <p>16 articles which you were complaining about during this</p> <p>17 period. I'm not going to turn any of them up but they</p> <p>18 were the ones that you complained about and that you</p> <p>19 took action in relation to; is that right?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. You tell us that in all of these actions --</p> <p>22 paragraph 17, I should say -- you tell us that in</p> <p>23 relation to all of these actions, you were successful,</p> <p>24 managing to obtain apologies in all but one of the</p> <p>25 cases, a statement in court, costs and damages.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 published that you were very concerned about, and you</p> <p>2 tell us in your witness statement, particularly at</p> <p>3 paragraph 14 onwards, that you decided that this time</p> <p>4 enough was enough, you weren't going to take the</p> <p>5 previous course of action, which was just to keep</p> <p>6 a dignified silence, you were going to do something</p> <p>7 about it. Can I understand why you decided to do</p> <p>8 something about it?</p> <p>9 A. On the back of the book, I realised that not everyone</p> <p>10 was against me, which is what I believed, and I think</p> <p>11 there still are many out there that wouldn't give me the</p> <p>12 time of day, but after writing the book, you know, the</p> <p>13 response was fantastic. So it gave -- probably gave me</p> <p>14 the strength and I thought, no, I can actually fight</p> <p>15 this, somebody will listen to what I've got to say and</p> <p>16 may hopefully believe me.</p> <p>17 Q. You also say that your children were supportive of you</p> <p>18 taking action.</p> <p>19 A. Yeah, I mean many times they've said to me I should do</p> <p>20 something about it and I've just always said no, so for</p> <p>21 them it was a relief.</p> <p>22 Q. What did you decide to do in respect of the articles</p> <p>23 that had been published about you?</p> <p>24 A. Sorry, say that again.</p> <p>25 Q. What did you decide to do, what action did you decide to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 However, you say, the real remedy would have been for</p> <p>2 them not to be published in the first place.</p> <p>3 A. Of course.</p> <p>4 Q. Can you tell the Inquiry, please, why an apology is</p> <p>5 important to you and why a statement in open court is</p> <p>6 important to you?</p> <p>7 A. The statement in open court to me was more important</p> <p>8 because I felt it was then out there and more people get</p> <p>9 to see it because obviously the apologies that are</p> <p>10 printed are minute, so people don't really see what's</p> <p>11 in, you know, an apology that's printed, but for me the</p> <p>12 statement in court was really important and I pushed</p> <p>13 hard and in fact a couple of cases, when damages were</p> <p>14 offered, I took less so that I could have a statement in</p> <p>15 open court.</p> <p>16 Q. I understand. In relation to the apologies, you've</p> <p>17 already touched on that, but were you satisfied by the</p> <p>18 way in which the apologies were published in the</p> <p>19 relevant newspapers?</p> <p>20 A. No, of course not. I mean, how can you be happy with,</p> <p>21 you know, a double page spread in the centre and a front</p> <p>22 page, and your apology is on page 14? I'm sure you've</p> <p>23 heard it all before, but it's tiny. So of course not.</p> <p>24 Why is it not given the same prominence? They actually</p> <p>25 say they'll give it similar prominence. It's nothing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

<p>1 like that.</p> <p>2 Q. Is there anything you'd like to add on that? The judge</p> <p>3 will be interested in your views as to what changes</p> <p>4 could be made in respect of that issue. Do you have any</p> <p>5 views on how apologies should be dealt with?</p> <p>6 A. Why aren't they given the same prominence?</p> <p>7 Q. Did taking legal action make a difference to the -- did</p> <p>8 it actually mean that people, newspapers, published</p> <p>9 fewer stories about you?</p> <p>10 A. Yes. I think it -- apart from the Daily Star that in</p> <p>11 the middle of taking action on two stories they then</p> <p>12 printed a third halfway through our action, which seemed</p> <p>13 crazy, so we just added that one on. I think since</p> <p>14 then, yes, it's definitely -- I like to think it's made</p> <p>15 them think, and I like to think that maybe now they're</p> <p>16 beginning to realise that it's not true what they're</p> <p>17 being fed or what they are being told or what they've</p> <p>18 decided to write for all these years. You know, one of</p> <p>19 the cases against the Sunday Mirror that almost went to</p> <p>20 court, the onus is on you as the victim to prove your</p> <p>21 innocence. It's not the journalist's job to prove what</p> <p>22 he's printed is true, it's your job then to prove that</p> <p>23 that's not the case.</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. And our evidence went in and it was -- you know, we had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 "It is important that the Inquiry understands that</p> <p>2 taking legal action is not an easy decision. Pursuing</p> <p>3 libel proceedings against a newspaper is extremely</p> <p>4 expensive [you tell us], time-consuming and stressful.</p> <p>5 In the most recent libel claim I pursued against the</p> <p>6 Mirror I was ultimately successful but the case only</p> <p>7 settled just before trial. In the meantime, in the</p> <p>8 summer of 2010 (shortly before trial), I had to put my</p> <p>9 house on the market in order to fund my legal costs."</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. "Fortunately the case settled just before it was sold,</p> <p>12 but this demonstrates just what is at stake."</p> <p>13 Is that correct?</p> <p>14 A. Absolutely. I had to put the house on the market.</p> <p>15 I was told that I needed to come up with £200,000, you</p> <p>16 know, to go into court. So where was I going to find</p> <p>17 that amount of money? All my money is in my home, so</p> <p>18 the only way I knew how to locate that was -- I think</p> <p>19 that's the problem. I think that the Sunday Mirror were</p> <p>20 hoping that, you know, a single parent with three</p> <p>21 children wouldn't perhaps have the backbone to go all</p> <p>22 the way and would be scared off at the prospect of</p> <p>23 having to find that sort of money.</p> <p>24 Q. It's not in your statement, but your book, Stronger,</p> <p>25 indicates that you have had at least in the past</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 huge evidence from witnesses, evidence from, you know,</p> <p>2 from the media, we had evidence from all sources, you</p> <p>3 know, bank statements, lawyers' letters, everything, and</p> <p>4 the only evidence they had that they gave back to me</p> <p>5 were phone messages. You know, phone -- taped phone</p> <p>6 conversations of the people that had fed them the story.</p> <p>7 And absolutely not one ounce of evidence to back up any</p> <p>8 of it.</p> <p>9 Q. Can I ask you a little bit about how you felt about</p> <p>10 having to take this action, legal action, and what</p> <p>11 impact that had on you?</p> <p>12 A. I was scared, because obviously I understood if any of</p> <p>13 the cases went to court, that there would be a jury, and</p> <p>14 having already felt I was on the back foot because my</p> <p>15 public persona was not good because I'd been labelled</p> <p>16 this money-grabbing awful person, that I kind of was up</p> <p>17 against it before I even got in there. So it was hard</p> <p>18 then, you know, financially, you know, you don't win</p> <p>19 even if you get damages. As we've heard, the costs,</p> <p>20 you're lucky if you get 60 to 70 per cent, you're lucky</p> <p>21 if you get 70 per cent of your costs.</p> <p>22 People think, oh, you sue, you get lots of money.</p> <p>23 It's far, far from the truth.</p> <p>24 Q. While we're on that, can I ask you about paragraph 21 of</p> <p>25 your statement, which deals with costs. You say:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 a relationship with Rebekah Brooks?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. By relationship I mean a friendship.</p> <p>4 A. Yes, absolutely.</p> <p>5 Q. How did that friendship come about?</p> <p>6 A. When I left Italy -- when I moved to Italy with Paul, so</p> <p>7 that would have been 1992, there were things going on</p> <p>8 that people didn't know about and the reasons that</p> <p>9 I left Italy are now known, but at the time no one knew</p> <p>10 that reason and I think Paul's advisers were very keen</p> <p>11 to keep that under wraps. There was a lot of</p> <p>12 speculation, "Why has she come away from Italy?" This</p> <p>13 I know from hindsight. At the time I was just going</p> <p>14 along with it.</p> <p>15 So they -- and I think one of Paul's advisers knew</p> <p>16 Rebekah, who at the time was just working on a magazine</p> <p>17 for the News of the World, I think, she was in the</p> <p>18 Sunday part of it, and they set up and sold a story --</p> <p>19 maybe that's the one you're talking about.</p> <p>20 Q. Maybe. I'll ask Mr Davies in a moment.</p> <p>21 A. So they set the story up to say why I'd left Italy, but</p> <p>22 it was all: this is all still fine, we're still</p> <p>23 together, and then I met Rebekah -- I met her at I think</p> <p>24 Heathrow, and that's the first time I met her, and then</p> <p>25 we flew out over to Rome together and just hit it off</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 immediately. And we had a friendship and it was purely                  2 a friendship. It wasn't a situation where I sold                  3 stories. It didn't even enter my head. We did have                  4 a good friendship and I considered her a very close                  5 friend.                  6 Q. Are you still friends now?                  7 A. I haven't seen her or spoken to her since about 2000,                  8 2001. I think it might be 2000. But I would still --                  9 I wouldn't have a bad word to say about her personally.                  10 Q. All right. I asked you earlier about the impact on your                  11 children and on yourself of the period when you were                  12 still with Paul and the media intrusion that you                  13 suffered at that time. Looking back over the last 20                  14 years, can you tell the Inquiry in a nutshell how you                  15 feel that all of this has impacted on both you and your                  16 children?                  17 A. Wherever I go and I meet people for the first time,                  18 I always feel I have to -- not explain myself because                  19 that would be a bit weird, to walk up and start saying,                  20 "This isn't really me", but I try to be over nice, to                  21 get across as quick as I can maybe the interpretation                  22 they have of me is not true and I want to get rid of any                  23 preconceived ideas they may have of me within the first                  24 sort of, you know, however many minutes I can. So it's                  25 difficult, and the children -- it's difficult for them,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 a matter of law, I think that they have to prove that                  2 what they've written, if it's defamatory of you, is                  3 true.                  4 A. I thinking if you asked any lawyers --                  5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's not to say that anybody                  6 would go into a case without amassing their own                  7 evidence.                  8 A. They do, though.                  9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that, I understand that                  10 But it's not that I'm suggesting, and I wasn't                  11 suggesting to Mr Lewis that it was okay for people to be                  12 defamed. What I'm saying is that there are grey areas,                  13 there are always going to be two different perspectives,                  14 so there has to be a way of solving it. There has to be                  15 a way of resolving issues where they're not black and                  16 white. The stuff you're talking about you say is quite                  17 clear, it's black and white, and for that, I don't think                  18 I'm going to disagree with you. But there are cases                  19 where there could be issues which have to find a way of                  20 being resolved.                  21 But actually, if I just pick up on that and say it                  22 strikes me there are three things you've spoken about,                  23 and I'd be very grateful if you could elaborate, how you                  24 put your concerns in relation to each.                  25 The first, which it seems to me is the most serious</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 and friends, because they feel they have to -- you feel                  2 you're constantly defending yourself and for them as                  3 well it's difficult because they're having to do the                  4 same.                  5 Q. I understand. I don't have any other questions but I do                  6 want to give you the opportunity to say anything you                  7 want to say or to complete anything you might have                  8 started and wanted to finish. Is there anything you'd                  9 like to add?                  10 A. No. It's not been easy to be here today. I just hope                  11 that because you're scared -- I am scared of                  12 repercussions, I'm scared of repercussions on my family,                  13 because that has been my, you know, experience in all of                  14 this, and I just think that a question that you were                  15 saying to Mr Lewis earlier, when he said to you that                  16 maybe if they didn't defame people in the first place,                  17 that there wouldn't be this issue of, you know, taking                  18 it to court, and you were like, well, that's never going                  19 to happen, but why shouldn't that happen? Why shouldn't                  20 they have to prove, like you have to prove as a victim,                  21 that it's not true? Why don't they have to prove that                  22 what they are printing is true?                  23 Questions from LORD JUSTICE LEVESON                  24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Actually, interestingly enough, as                  25 a matter of law, that is the wrong way around. As</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 of what you've spoken about, but you tell me, is                  2 accuracy.                  3 A. Yes.                  4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That there is no excuse for                  5 publishing about you material that is demonstrably                  6 wrong, or which, on checking, could be established to be                  7 wrong.                  8 A. Well, exactly. You know, such things as I'm made out to                  9 be a bad mother because I've stopped Paul having contact                  10 with his son because I've changed my telephone number.                  11 My telephone number has never changed. How difficult                  12 can that be and how hurtful -- you know, to find that                  13 out, for one, and how hurtful is that for my son when                  14 his father doesn't have any contact with him through his                  15 own choice, solely, that it's printed that, oh, his dad                  16 wants to get in contact but because he's changed his                  17 phone, he can't.                  18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. That's the first                  19 point, accuracy.                  20 A. Mm-hm.                  21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I entirely agree with the proposition                  22 which I think you've said, but if you didn't, you                  23 certainly would, namely that it's much better that they                  24 don't publish stuff that's inaccurate, than there is                  25 a remedy if they do.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 A. Yes, and the remedy has to be such a big enough 2 deterrent that they think twice about it. Because the 3 profit margin, it doesn't affect them, what they have to 4 pay out. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. The second point 6 you've made is about privacy. 7 A. Right. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you help me, Mrs Gascoigne, if 9 you will. Reading between the lines of what you've 10 said, and please correct me if I'm wrong, it's: 11 "I recognised what I was getting into before I got into 12 it, and I recognised that a loss of privacy for a very, 13 very high profile footballer was going to be 14 a consequence". 15 A. Yes. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: "However, as his fortunes have waned 17 and our path has diverged", you've been concerned that 18 the privacy once lost for that period should not be 19 irrecoverable, in other words you should be able to 20 retain or obtain some privacy again as time has passed. 21 Or do you -- 22 A. We didn't really have any privacy then, though, did we? 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, the point -- 24 A. That's not a huge thing for me. I think that if you're 25 in the public eye, it's something -- although I was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 privacy aspect, except where it becomes intrusive, the 2 photographers and the rest -- 3 A. Mm-hm. 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- it's the accuracy. 5 A. It's the accuracy and, yeah, if they start -- it's 6 difficult for me now because I don't have that which 7 I used to have. If you were asking me that five, six 8 years ago, then yeah, it's awful to be followed every 9 time you go anywhere and you're having to, you know, 10 lose photographers. But it's kind of like I never 11 really complained too much about it because it kind of 12 went with the territory. 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And do you think it still goes with 14 the territory? 15 A. Well, the fact that I'm sitting in here today, probably 16 I am still asking for it. So I will have to deal with 17 it. But just if you're going to print anything about 18 me, just make sure it's factual before you ... 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Okay. Then the third point -- so 20 it's where you were on these three areas: accuracy, 21 privacy, and then the third point is remedy. 22 A. Mm. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And the need for swifter, cheaper, 24 more effective remedies, because the prospect of putting 25 your house on the market --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 attached to somebody that was in the public eye, is 2 something that you have to kind of deal with. 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's what I've said. So that you 4 accepted that. 5 A. Mm. 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: With your relationship with your 7 husband, but that I rather gather, I'm not expressing 8 myself perhaps very well, that as your relationship with 9 Paul moved in different directions, however you might 10 have reacted with your book and with other things for 11 other reasons, you were entitled to regain some of the 12 privacy that you had lost when you had your relationship 13 with Paul. Is that -- 14 A. I don't know whether that's really what -- whether I'm 15 understanding you correctly. I don't really think 16 that's what I -- I would just like things to be, if 17 they're going to be reported, to be reported correctly, 18 because I don't know how if you have -- like I've been 19 asked: if you sold your wedding, if I've written a book, 20 if I have chosen to go onto a programme like I'm a 21 Celebrity, then I am asking for it. You know, to be -- 22 for people to make comments about you. But why can't 23 they put them correctly? It's just not -- 24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: This is the precise purpose of my 25 asking you the question. So it's not so much the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 A. It has to be a huge deterrent, like it's been 2 a deterrent for many people for years not to take 3 a libel case, because that's what I believed, it was 4 just not worth it, and there's been some horrific libel 5 cases that have been done, you know, Gillian Taylforth's 6 case, I know one forgets how awful that must have been, 7 but it puts people off. So that was a huge deterrent, 8 I think, for a lot of people, and then -- but where's 9 the deterrent for them not to print libel and not to 10 print untruths? 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. I understand the 12 point. So what I've tried to do in those three points 13 was to summarise where you stood in relation to each, 14 and I hope I've done that accurately. Is there anything 15 you want to say as a result of what I've asked you, or 16 indeed otherwise? 17 A. No, I think just a deterrent has to be there, it has to 18 be, you know, costs should mean costs and not just -- 19 I don't understand why, when you sue a paper and it's 20 blatantly obvious that they don't have anything and they 21 completely fabricated a story, that you still are out of 22 pocket. 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Okay. I understand that. You've 24 made the point that you're concerned, and I understand 25 why, that coming along here might have consequences.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 A. Mm.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I hope you've heard that I've said</p> <p>3 something about that.</p> <p>4 A. I know.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And that's something which I will</p> <p>6 certainly keep an eye out for, so if there's anything</p> <p>7 that you find out, that you feel I ought to know about,</p> <p>8 then you must make sure your solicitors know.</p> <p>9 A. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very, very much for coming</p> <p>11 A. Thank you.</p> <p>12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand the decision you had to</p> <p>13 make, and I am grateful to you.</p> <p>14 A. Thank you.</p> <p>15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>16 MS PATRY HOSKINS: Thank you very much indeed.</p> <p>17 Sir, it's 12.30. I understand that we could fit in</p> <p>18 the third witness before lunch, but you may well want to</p> <p>19 deal with --</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't know. I don't know whether</p> <p>21 I want to deal with anything else until I know what's</p> <p>22 been happening.</p> <p>23 MS PATRY HOSKINS: Mr Jay isn't here.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Because my team aren't here to tell</p> <p>25 me, although I'm perfectly happy to rely on anybody</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 Discussion</p> <p>2 MR DAVIES: Mr Lewis gave evidence that a journalist, who</p> <p>3 I'm not going to name, had been instructed in how to</p> <p>4 hack by Mr Mulcaire while that journalist was reporting</p> <p>5 to Mr Simon Greenberg at the Evening Standard. Mr Lewis</p> <p>6 also said that Mr Greenberg went on to recruit that</p> <p>7 journalist to Times Newspapers Limited and Mr Greenberg</p> <p>8 does now work for News International.</p> <p>9 What I would like to say is simply this. First of</p> <p>10 all, Mr Greenberg left the Evening Standard in July</p> <p>11 2004. We do not know when the teaching that Mr Lewis</p> <p>12 referred to happened, but we believe it to be after</p> <p>13 that. Mr Greenberg did not work in the press but in the</p> <p>14 football industry from July 2004 until January this</p> <p>15 year, 2011. He was not involved in the recruitment of</p> <p>16 the journalist to Times Newspapers Limited. That</p> <p>17 journalist was recruited by Times Newspapers Limited,</p> <p>18 started work and went on long-term sick leave before</p> <p>19 Mr Greenberg arrived at News International.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right.</p> <p>21 MR DAVIES: That is important, I should explain, because</p> <p>22 Mr Greenberg is a member of the Management and Standards</p> <p>23 Committee at News International, which is responsible</p> <p>24 for dealing with this Inquiry and the police.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 else.</p> <p>2 MR DAVIES: I do have something to say, but I'm slightly</p> <p>3 reluctant to say it without Mr Jay here.</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I agree. Perhaps somebody</p> <p>5 could -- could you please see if Mr Jay is about?</p> <p>6 MS PATRY HOSKINS: Mr Jay is also dealing with the third</p> <p>7 witness, so unfortunately ...</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I know, I know.</p> <p>9 MS PATRY HOSKINS: We're struggling very slightly.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: He's likely to return if I ask him</p> <p>11 to.</p> <p>12 MS PATRY HOSKINS: I'm sure that's right. (Pause)</p> <p>13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Now, Mr Jay, on the issue that was</p> <p>14 being raised before, is there anything I need to know at</p> <p>15 this stage?</p> <p>16 MR JAY: I think Mr Rhodri Davies has a submission to make,</p> <p>17 but whether you need to hear that submission now or at</p> <p>18 2 o'clock depends on how urgent he feels it is --</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It depends how urgent he feels it is.</p> <p>20 MR JAY: Yes.</p> <p>21 MR DAVIES: I feel it is urgent.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Then you'd better make it.</p> <p>23 MR DAVIES: It's not a submission, it's a matter of</p> <p>24 clarification for Mr Lewis's evidence.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 MR DAVIES: So his position is a matter of importance to us.</p> <p>2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that.</p> <p>3 MR DAVIES: That's all I wanted to say.</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. Yes, Mr Caplan?</p> <p>5 MR CAPLAN: If I can say three things. One is this in</p> <p>6 relation to that matter. In relation to the journalist</p> <p>7 involved, I'm just seeing what information is in the</p> <p>8 public domain. It may be that we'll make an</p> <p>9 application. I think it would be better and certainly</p> <p>10 would be in the interests of clarity if his name could</p> <p>11 be published. I think it will be a matter for you, but</p> <p>12 we're seeing what material there is about that</p> <p>13 individual in the public domain or not.</p> <p>14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. I understand the point.</p> <p>15 MR CAPLAN: Also as a matter of clarification, Ms Platell's</p> <p>16 name was mentioned this morning in the context of some</p> <p>17 relationship with Rebekah Brooks and being asked to</p> <p>18 write an article to settle an old score. Might I just</p> <p>19 say that that is absolutely refuted.</p> <p>20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. I didn't draw the inference, as</p> <p>21 I think I made clear in your presence earlier today.</p> <p>22 I didn't link the two points.</p> <p>23 MR CAPLAN: Thank you.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right.</p> <p>25 MS PHILLIPS: Sir, could I possibly update you about the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

24 (Pages 93 to 96)



<p>1 other matter that was raised this morning?                  2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.                  3 MS PHILLIPS: Further to what Mr Davies has told you, I can                  4 confirm that the Guardian had a strongly worded                  5 complaint from the Sun about the front page. My                  6 instructions are that the story about the Sun was                  7 incorrect and we will be publishing an appropriate                  8 correction and apology, which will go up on the rolling                  9 online corrections column as soon as agreed and will be                  10 the lead correction in print tomorrow. We will also                  11 remove the offending two paragraphs of Marina's sketch                  12 from the online version.                  13 As you'll be aware, it's a long-standing practice of                  14 my client to publish daily corrections and                  15 clarifications in a corrections column, alongside the                  16 leader column. It's where readers expect to see                  17 corrections and clarifications and is therefore                  18 considered the appropriate place to publish the apology.                  19 We'd also like to apologise to the Inquiry for this                  20 having had to take up their time this morning before                  21 you. Thank you.                  22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. I'm pleased                  23 that that's all happened. I suppose I might be forgiven                  24 for saying -- or echoing some of the evidence that has                  25 been given this morning, that rather better than the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.                  2 MR JAY: Who may or may not be able to complete before the                  3 short adjournment, but there's no rush. It's Mr Tom                  4 Rowland.                  5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very good.                  6 MR THOMAS HARDY ROWLAND (affirmed)                  7 A. Can I take my jacket off?                  8 MR JAY: Certainly, Mr Rowland. Please make yourself                  9 comfortable. I'm sure your glass of water is filled up,                  10 if you'd like some. Could you confirm your full name                  11 please.                  12 A. Thomas Hardy Rowland.                  13 MR JAY: Thank you very much.                  14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Rowland thank you also very much                  15 As a journalist, I don't put you in quite the same                  16 category as some of the other witnesses who have come --                  17 A. Quite right, sir, I don't deserve to be in the same                  18 category.                  19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But I'm still grateful.                  20 Questions from MR JAY                  21 MR JAY: Mr Rowland, it's probably my fault. I've only seen                  22 a statement of yours in draft. Could you confirm,                  23 please, that there is a signed version of your witness                  24 statement?                  25 A. Yes, there is.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 very appropriate steps you're now taking would have been                  2 if it hadn't been there in the first place.                  3 MS PHILLIPS: Understood.                  4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much.                  5 MR GARNHAM: Can I just say in response to what Mr Caplan                  6 said that the Metropolitan Police would resist --                  7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, I understand.                  8 Mr Jay, let's carry on.                  9 MR JAY: Yes.                  10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But let me just add this: I am very                  11 conscious of the very careful line that we are trying to                  12 walk.                  13 MR JAY: Yes.                  14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: If not a tightrope from which we                  15 might fall. I hope that we can review our practices and                  16 the practices that we have with our core participants to                  17 learn from the experiences that we've just had to try to                  18 make sure that this is a one-off and is not repeated.                  19 MR JAY: Yes.                  20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.                  21 MR JAY: Sir, that is noted and understood. The size of the                  22 tightrope, though, is very, very slim and in some cases                  23 is almost a piece of cotton thread.                  24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Jay, I never said it was easy.                  25 MR JAY: May we move on to the next witness.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 Q. Could you provide us, please, with the date of the                  2 signature?                  3 A. The 9th day of November 2011.                  4 Q. I'm grateful, Mr Rowland. There's a statement of truth,                  5 so this is your evidence. Do you follow me?                  6 A. Yes. Can I just say before we go any further that there                  7 is actually a matter of fact that has changed in this.                  8 Two days ago the Metropolitan Police Service released an                  9 unredacted version of the call log from                  10 News International and the number of calls is actually                  11 100 and not 60, as it is written in this statement.                  12 Q. We'll come to that as you give the narrative. It's not                  13 a correction so much as an additional fact which has                  14 come to your notice?                  15 A. Yes, but it does say in here that there were 60 and in                  16 fact there were 100.                  17 Q. Tell us first of all a little bit about yourself. We                  18 know that you're a journalist. In a thumbnail sketch,                  19 your career as a journalist?                  20 A. Yeah, I've been a journalist for 30 years, since the                  21 1980s. I started as a technology writer writing about                  22 computing and telecommunications. I was the chief                  23 reporter on Electronics Times, which was the weekly                  24 newspaper covering the technology sector. I went on                  25 after that to work for the Daily Telegraph. I was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

<p>1 a subeditor there, and a feature writer. I was then 2 appointed the property correspondent and I ran and 3 edited the property section of the Daily Telegraph for 4 seven years or so. 5 In 1997 I left to pursue a career in television. 6 I went to work for Basil Productions, which is the 7 company that later became Endemol. I wrote and 8 developed with them some formats for game shows and 9 I presented and I -- with both Lorraine Kelly and Davina 10 McCall shows that they put out. 11 Q. Yes. 12 A. And I then became the chief executive -- I was offered 13 the job of being the chief executive of an Internet 14 company, and then about 2001, I went back to journalism 15 and I -- freelance, principally for magazines, for the 16 Times, for the Sunday Times, for the Mail on Sunday and 17 for the Evening Standard, I wrote a column there for 18 a while. 19 I've written four books. One is about British 20 technology policy in the 1970s and 1980s called The 21 Inmos Saga, one is about the financing of the 22 Channel Tunnel, called How to Sink a Fortune, one is 23 a guide on building houses for yourself and one is 24 a book about living in France. 25 Two years ago, I started a campaigning organisation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 believe that my voicemail had been intercepted, and then 2 subsequently by a letter from the Metropolitan Police. 3 Q. Yes. 4 A. I decided that I needed some legal help, so I phoned 5 Chris Bryant, the MP, up, and asked him if he could 6 possibly tell me who his lawyers were, who knew 7 something about phone hacking, and from that I got into 8 this process and I was anxious to participate in this 9 Inquiry because I think I have some knowledge and 10 insights that can help you. 11 Q. So in late August, there was a meeting, I understand, 12 involving members of Operation Weeting and your 13 solicitor. May I ask you, please, whether during the 14 course of that meeting you saw redacted or unredacted 15 versions of the Mulcaire notebooks insofar as they 16 related to you? 17 A. No. I didn't. I saw the phone logs of 18 News International, which were referred to as the phone 19 logs of the News of the World at the time, but it was 20 a redacted version. 21 Q. And what, in general terms, did those phone logs 22 demonstrate, if anything? 23 A. Mr Jay, it might be helpful if we talked about the 24 unredacted ones that I got yesterday, because there's 25 a substantial and terribly important difference between</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 called Forward, and I set up a series of websites, the 2 most prominent of which is called Trains for Deal, which 3 was a community-based campaign to get the high speed 1 4 train to stop in Deal and Sandwich in Kent, and that 5 campaign has been successful, the first fast train 6 stopped in Deal and Sandwich this year, so if I suppose 7 my daughter ever says, "Daddy, have you ever done 8 anything worthwhile in your life?" I can say at least 9 I made the trains run on time. 10 Q. You're in danger of travelling a little outside the 11 parameters of this Inquiry, but if there's anything else 12 you'd like to say which is germane to what we're doing, 13 please feel free. 14 A. Yes, indeed. 15 Q. In terms of the background it is right to say that you 16 are a claimant in the voicemail interception litigation 17 which is due to be heard by Mr Justice Vos in January of 18 next year. 19 A. Yes, that is the case. 20 Q. You discovered, I think, quite recently that your 21 voicemail may well have been be hacked. That was in 22 August of this year. Could you tell us, please, the 23 circumstances in which you came to that knowledge? 24 A. Yes. I was informed by letter by first of all the 25 telephone company, T-Mobile, that they had reason to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 the two. 2 Q. May I interrupt you, first of all, because I don't know 3 what you're going to say about the unredacted ones, it 4 may or may not cause a difficulty for others at this 5 Inquiry. First of all, in August 2011, you were shown 6 the redacted versions? 7 A. Yes, indeed. 8 Q. And ignoring what you may have learnt since looking at 9 the unredacted versions, what information or deductions 10 did you draw at the time from looking at the redacted 11 versions? 12 A. That there was a long series of telephone calls that 13 started in 2005 and went through to mid-2006 that went 14 through to my voicemail, that went through to the code 15 that got through to speaking -- or listening to the 16 actual calls there. 17 Q. Yes. 18 A. And that it was a very bizarre pattern. It was hard to 19 understand how anybody could make calls on the 20 regularity that had been made. There was nine in one 21 day. 22 Q. Yes. 23 A. I do remember that in your own very excellent 24 introduction to these proceedings, you did point out 25 that on the cases that had been settled by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

<p>1 News International, the most prolific piece of hacking 2 that had gone on was Mr Skylet Andrews, and I believe 3 you said there were 19 calls that were unsuccessful and 4 14 that were successful through to his voicemail. In 5 this case, when I saw the redacted version, it appeared 6 that there were 60 calls through, and 2 successful ones. 7 It now appears that there are 100, and 2 successful 8 ones.</p> <p>9 I have to say that if you were the hacking manager 10 at News International or News of the World, you would 11 have to have a word with whoever did the hacking, on my 12 phone because the productivity rate is abysmally low, 13 he's making 50 calls for every successful one, compared 14 to two calls for every successful one in the case of 15 Mr Skylet Andrews, and it made me very suspicious about 16 what was going on, and when I saw the unredacted 17 version, those suspicions became very much larger.</p> <p>18 Q. In terms of clarifying that piece of evidence, the 19 reference to a successful call, is it going to the 20 length of the call that you can deduce that it wasn't 21 merely just phoning into the voicemail to see whether 22 there were messages, which might just take a few 23 seconds; because of the length of the call you can 24 reasonably infer that whoever is carrying out the call 25 is listening to a substantive message? Do I have that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 The piece of information that had been redacted was 2 the originating number. When I saw the redacted 3 version, the number that all these calls had come from 4 was not there, we couldn't see that on the log. When it 5 was sent through by the Metropolitan Police, that had 6 been added.</p> <p>7 Now, it's always, in every single case, 100 cases, 8 it's the same number --</p> <p>9 Q. Yes, okay, you can tell us it's the same number but -- 10 A. I'm not going to tell you what the number is -- 11 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>12 A. -- but it is the same number and it's a mobile number, 13 which is quite because the technology exists to add 14 a mobile phone to an office PBX system -- PBX stands for 15 private branch exchange, it's the technical term for 16 what's going on here -- but it's always exactly the same 17 number. And I have no evidence for this, but it is my 18 strong, strong suspicion that this evidence has been 19 tampered with. I do not believe the call log as it 20 exists there is at all credible. I think that my phone 21 was hacked but I think that a lot of those calls 22 actually were perfectly innocent calls to extensions -- 23 or from extensions inside News International because 24 I was working for the Times a lot at the time, and 25 I think that what has happened is that somebody has</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>
<p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. No, I mean these -- there were two specific events that 3 were highlighted by the Metropolitan Police Service, and 4 they said to me that these indicated the caller had gone 5 right the way through the mailbox and had got to the 6 point that somebody was listening through the calls and 7 they had specific evidence of that. I mean, you must 8 ask them, ask officers of Operation Weeting exactly what 9 they mean by that, but that is what I understood and 10 that is what my solicitor understood.</p> <p>11 Q. Thank you. You've carefully confined your evidence to 12 what your understanding was. I'm grateful for that.</p> <p>13 I'm going to tread carefully here. In relation to 14 what you've learnt more recently, you've looked at 15 unredacted material. I don't want to know the substance 16 of that term, but what it demonstrates --</p> <p>17 A. Can I interrupt you, actually? Can I just explain how 18 call logging works? I think it might be helpful to you 19 if I did so. A call logger is essentially an audit of 20 what an office telephone system does. It tells you 21 which extension inside a building or organisation a call 22 comes from, it tells you how long it is and it tells you 23 what the destination is. There might be other 24 information involved as well, but essentially those 25 three things are what you find on a call log.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 tampered with the evidence, and I think that this 2 Inquiry needs to ask some very sharp questions about --</p> <p>3 I'll go back a little. I think you have a silent 4 witness who you can legitimately ask to come here and 5 ask questions of, and that silent witness is that 6 computer, that telephone PBX, because you need to know 7 about its architecture, you need to know about its 8 maintenance, you need to know about the security codes 9 getting into it, you need to know about who had access 10 to it and you need to look at its audit records.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I wonder whether that's actually 12 right, Mr Rowland, because at the moment I'm looking at 13 the mantra: culture, practices and ethics, and I'm not 14 looking at the specifics of who did what to whom and 15 when. If I go down the route you've suggested, aren't 16 I really trespassing on that territory, which at 17 present, at any rate, entirely falls within the remit of 18 the Metropolitan Police?</p> <p>19 A. Well, I mean, I think you have a problem, sir, which 20 is -- which you've mentioned and alluded to many times, 21 which is that you're trying to have a very broad Inquiry 22 that is necessarily based on a very narrow evidential 23 base, and the evidential base is essentially the 24 Glenn Mulcaire diaries, of which there are 11,000 pages, 25 and these call logs --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think that's right, you see.                  2 I think it is much broader than that, because, as you've                  3 been hearing, as you've been listening, I've been                  4 dealing with many things besides --                  5 A. Indeed, but -- yes, I understand that, but in relation                  6 to the actual phone hacking element, I mean when                  7 Mr Grant was here, you, Mr Jay, were quite rightly                  8 looking and picking him up on the difference between                  9 supposition and fact, and the only facts that you have                  10 in relation to phone hacking are the call log and the                  11 diaries of Glenn Mulcaire, so in that sense it's quite                  12 pertinent and it's quite key. The reason being that                  13 what a call log should be able to tell you is exactly                  14 where inside an organisation calls come from. It should                  15 be able to tell you whether, for instance, the calls                  16 come from the Sun's newsroom or the News of the World's                  17 newsroom or some other place inside News International.                  18 Now, it is my contention that quite a lot of those                  19 100 calls actually were perfectly innocent calls, that                  20 they were coming -- they were normal traffic that was                  21 coming to me because I was working for the Times                  22 newspaper, and that it was -- it appears that it's not                  23 innocent because the originating phone number is always                  24 the same, it's always this mobile number --                  25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I've got the point. I've got the                  Page 109</p>	<p>1 in relation to the calls into your voicemail which were                  2 not innocent, the object was not to discover matters                  3 relating to your private life but more to discover                  4 matters which may bear on commercial confidences? Have                  5 I correctly understood --                  6 A. Yes, Mr Jay, you have. In a nutshell, during 2002,                  7 2003, I was working quite a lot for the Mail on Sunday,                  8 I'm that shadowy beast, the Mail on Sunday freelancer                  9 about which much is written and very little seen, quite                  10 often. Because of the nature of -- they hired me                  11 essentially to set up and to advise them on a property                  12 supplement which they wanted to run. That necessarily                  13 involved talking to a lot of prominent and famous                  14 people, and, you know, when you stop doing something,                  15 people sometimes think you are still doing it, so it's                  16 possible that people were fishing, looking for leads                  17 relating to that.                  18 During 2005, I wrote a long series of articles for                  19 the Times newspaper which were about alternative                  20 investments and the alternative investments in motorcars                  21 through to wine through to expensive bars of gold and                  22 stamps that, you know, that people had decided to go                  23 into, and that again involved talking to a lot of quite                  24 well-known people.                  25 I think it's relevant that the interview technique                  Page 111</p>
<p>1 point.                  2 A. Thank you. The reason I'd have a large amount of                  3 perfectly ordinary, innocent traffic coming through is                  4 that subeditors on the Times would quite properly and                  5 naturally ring me up and ask me points of fact, whether                  6 in fact you spelt Robert as in Robert Jay with an R or                  7 with a W or whatever, and it's inevitable that                  8 journalists make slips and, you know, there's matters of                  9 consistency and it's important they find out this                  10 information, so I could quite understand them contacting                  11 me by mobile phone. Usually they would go through to my                  12 office number, and if they didn't do that, they'd email                  13 me, so I think more typically than coming to me by                  14 a mobile phone, so there wouldn't be many of these, but                  15 that stream should be in there somewhere and I think                  16 that has happened is it actually has been confused with                  17 the more sinister pieces, and one wonders why.                  18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that. I've got the                  19 issue. It's certainly something that doubtless the                  20 police will look at in the light of what you've said,                  21 and we'll have to consider how far we can take it.                  22 Thank you.                  23 MR JAY: Can I hone in on what your evidence is about and                  24 try and deal with it in this way, Mr Rowland. On my                  25 understanding, what you're telling the Inquiry is that                  Page 110</p>	<p>1 that I adopted then was not the usual "slash, burn and                  2 run" technique that many reporters adopt, in other words                  3 they go and see somebody, ask them some questions, rush                  4 off, write the piece and then duck and hope that the                  5 flak doesn't hit them. What I was doing was to write                  6 drafts of the pieces and then send them to people and                  7 ask for their comments, and I did that for two reasons.                  8 Firstly, because of the appalling culture of tabloid                  9 excesses, people are reluctant to actually talk to me at                  10 all and it was a way of getting them -- drawing them                  11 into the process. Secondly, I felt that some of the                  12 subjects I was being asked to write about, I wasn't                  13 wildly expert on, although I knew quite a lot about it,                  14 so there was a more chance, a more-than-usual chance                  15 that I was going to make factual errors, and it was as                  16 way of stopping that happening. And also, I wasn't                  17 giving them editorial control, I was asking them to                  18 engage in a process and a debate, and I found it quite                  19 productive to do that.                  20 However, it did mean that there was more phone                  21 traffic going backwards and forwards between me than                  22 usually is the case, so messages were being left for me,                  23 and I was responding. So it was worthwhile for                  24 a fisherman to fish, in a phone hacking sense. There                  25 was something for them to look for.                  Page 112</p>

<p>1 Then in 2006, I wrote another long series of stories  2 for the Times, which was about -- if you recall, right  3 at the beginning I said I had a background in technology  4 writing in journalism, so I do have some expertise in  5 that area, and I wrote a long series of pieces that were  6 about the confluence of telecommunications and  7 computing, and identity theft -- which seems somewhat  8 ironic in retrospect, that whilst I was writing about  9 identity theft, my own phone was being hacked, but that  10 appears to be what was going on -- but that in itself  11 was enough bait, I suppose, for me to have been of  12 interest. So I think those were the reasons, without  13 going on too much, about why it was that I was of  14 interest.</p> <p>15 Q. Yes. One particular matter you draw attention to, there  16 may have been interest in what high-worth individuals or  17 celebrities were doing in relation to house purchases  18 and you might be an easy source, as it were, of such  19 information?</p> <p>20 A. Indeed, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. In paragraph 21 of your statement, you say you strongly  22 suspect what the evidence points to, it's the culture of  23 routine phone hacking by journalists working for the  24 News of the World. That's an inference which you're  25 inviting the Inquiry to make, having regard to your  Page 113</p>	
<p>1 evidence and a host of other evidence; is that correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yeah. I mean, Alan Rusbridger when he was here, the  3 editor of the Guardian, was talking about how the  4 culture of phone hacking was ingrained at the  5 News of the World, and you know, the intelligence is  6 that that is not the case elsewhere. However, it now  7 beggars believe that there was just one person doing it,  8 so it appears that it was widespread there.</p> <p>9 Q. I think you're striking at an issue of fact and then of  10 inference, which it is part and parcel of what this  11 Inquiry is seeking to explore. It's not for me to  12 comment on that. You have focused on a point and  13 plainly that will have to be considered in the light of  14 all the other evidence.</p> <p>15 A. Mm.</p> <p>16 Q. I'm interested in what you say in paragraph 22 --</p> <p>17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's moving on to impact, isn't it?</p> <p>18 MR JAY: Yes.</p> <p>19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We have impact and regulation to do  20 so we'll do that at 2 o'clock. Thank you very much  21 indeed.</p> <p>22 (1.01 pm)</p> <p>23 (The luncheon adjournment)</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>	

<b>A</b>	109:6	<b>albeit</b> 48:1	<b>application</b> 23:16 25:11 55:6 58:8 96:9	91:16 112:17	<b>background</b> 13:1 58:10 59:21 63:17 102:15 113:3	<b>benefit</b> 67:8 <b>best</b> 4:9 12:22 26:22 59:12 61:9 63:14
<b>abilities</b> 11:10	<b>Adakini</b> 47:15	<b>alcohol</b> 32:20	<b>applications</b> 24:16	<b>aspect</b> 6:23 43:22,23 91:1	<b>backwards</b> 112:21	<b>better</b> 59:15 72:18 88:23 94:22 96:9 97:25
<b>ability</b> 50:6	<b>add</b> 45:1 52:11 81:2 86:9 98:10 107:13	<b>alerts</b> 61:23	<b>apply</b> 17:19 48:11	<b>assessed</b> 31:11	<b>bad</b> 65:14 71:12 71:16,19 72:3 85:9 88:9	<b>Bianca</b> 64:2
<b>able</b> 30:3 32:1 36:10 45:19 46:6 49:2 50:7 50:8,25 51:17 54:3 75:8 77:5 89:19 99:2 109:13,15	<b>added</b> 20:3 81:13 107:6	<b>alighted</b> 66:7	<b>applying</b> 25:8	<b>assessment</b> 54:19	<b>bait</b> 113:11	<b>big</b> 21:20 50:1 89:1
<b>abolish</b> 50:2 52:2	<b>additional</b> 100:13	<b>allegation</b> 56:3	<b>appointed</b> 101:2	<b>assessor</b> 31:12	<b>balance</b> 23:22 47:4,7,17,18 53:7	<b>bikes</b> 75:14
<b>abolished</b> 52:3	<b>address</b> 4:23 12:13 40:23,25	<b>allegations</b> 5:2 67:17,18,20	<b>appreciate</b> 6:25 12:2 48:21 56:8	<b>assigned</b> 49:10	<b>bank</b> 35:23 82:3	<b>bill</b> 28:13
<b>abolishing</b> 50:5 52:3	<b>adjournment</b> 55:3 56:25 57:16 59:9 60:18 99:3 114:23	<b>allegedly</b> 48:4 45:22 46:21 72:18	<b>approach</b> 7:10 32:10 38:7 51:13	<b>Assistant</b> 38:20	<b>bar</b> 31:21 32:18	<b>birth</b> 72:2,7 <b>bit</b> 2:5 27:20 34:10 42:21 53:22 64:15 69:15 82:9 85:19 100:17
<b>absence</b> 45:20	<b>Administrative</b> 2:7	<b>altercation</b> 17:24	<b>approached</b> 15:5 34:19 43:21	<b>Associated</b> 27:4 39:6,9,12 41:19 55:24 57:25	<b>Baroness</b> 37:6 38:4,9	<b>BlackBerry</b> 36:20
<b>absolute</b> 45:24	<b>admission</b> 27:15 54:18	<b>alternative</b> 23:7 48:25 54:10 111:19,20	<b>appropriate</b> 2:2 5:7 6:23 8:6,12 56:12 97:7,18 98:1	<b>assume</b> 6:9	<b>Barr</b> 1:4 4:12,13 4:15,20,22 5:17 7:18 10:14,16 11:7 11:10,20,21 12:8,9 14:20 25:22 31:16 36:22 37:2,20 41:11 46:23 55:5,8 56:24 56:25 57:4 59:6,14,25	<b>blatant</b> 70:19 <b>blatantly</b> 92:20
<b>absolutely</b> 7:13 8:15 42:7 63:15 79:13 82:7 83:14 84:4 96:19	<b>admissions</b> 22:3 <b>admit</b> 54:17	<b>alteration</b> 23:7 48:25 54:10 111:19,20	<b>arch</b> 30:20	<b>atmosphere</b> 32:7	<b>blatantly</b> 92:20	<b>blowing</b> 3:2 <b>bluster</b> 24:23
<b>abundantly</b> 8:14	<b>adopt</b> 112:2	<b>amount</b> 44:24 49:22 77:19,20 83:17 110:2	<b>architecture</b> 108:7	<b>attached</b> 5:11 90:1	<b>blatantly</b> 92:20	<b>book</b> 64:8,10 76:20,22 77:3 77:4,6,24 78:9 78:12 83:24 90:10,19 101:24
<b>abysmally</b> 105:12	<b>adopted</b> 112:1	<b>amassing</b> 87:6 <b>amended</b> 24:11	<b>area</b> 113:5	<b>attack</b> 46:13,14 <b>attacking</b> 58:14 <b>attempted</b> 57:11 <b>attention</b> 6:14 67:22 69:20 76:25 113:15	<b>blatantly</b> 92:20	<b>books</b> 101:19
<b>accept</b> 15:12 17:6,8 22:8 23:7	<b>ADR</b> 54:11	<b>analysed</b> 22:1	<b>areas</b> 87:12 91:20	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>bars</b> 111:21	<b>born</b> 64:1
<b>accepted</b> 41:16 90:4	<b>admission</b> 27:15 54:18	<b>Andrews</b> 34:22 105:2,15	<b>arguments</b> 52:5	<b>audit</b> 106:19 108:10	<b>base</b> 50:3 108:23 108:23	<b>bothered</b> 57:13
<b>access</b> 50:1 108:9	<b>admissions</b> 22:3 <b>admit</b> 54:17	<b>and/or</b> 74:6	<b>arisen</b> 37:5	<b>August</b> 102:22 103:11 104:5	<b>based</b> 23:17 108:22	<b>bottom</b> 3:19 14:22 62:23
<b>accessible</b> 49:25 51:23	<b>advise</b> 23:7 111:11	<b>announcement</b> 42:19	<b>arises</b> 58:17	<b>author</b> 2:25	<b>bashing</b> 42:22	<b>bought</b> 73:8
<b>accidents</b> 53:13	<b>advised</b> 2:16 28:17	<b>annual</b> 38:10	<b>arising</b> 13:17	<b>authority</b> 33:5 33:22 50:18	<b>basically</b> 32:7 38:19 74:5	<b>branch</b> 107:15
<b>accuracy</b> 3:7 88:2,19 91:4,5 91:20	<b>advocates</b> 67:3 74:11 84:10,15	<b>anonymity</b> 1:6	<b>arm</b> 73:2	<b>available</b> 7:23 8:20 9:23 36:23 38:12	<b>Basil</b> 101:6	<b>breach</b> 8:16 15:10 17:1 23:2
<b>accurately</b> 92:14	<b>advocate</b> 47:14	<b>answer</b> 41:11 57:20	<b>arms</b> 50:10	<b>avoid</b> 44:21 53:1 53:4 73:2	<b>basis</b> 2:5 23:2 30:21 40:11,12	<b>break</b> 11:25 34:15 46:21 56:22
<b>accused</b> 42:5	<b>adversarial</b> 52:21	<b>anti-BBC</b> 42:4	<b>Armstrong</b> 17:12,15 18:1 33:7	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>BBC</b> 41:24 42:1 42:2	<b>breaking</b> 35:25 <b>breakout</b> 32:25
<b>accustomed</b> 68:7	<b>adversarial</b> 52:21	<b>Antonia</b> 47:22	<b>Armstrong's</b> 19:20	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>becoming</b> 76:3	<b>brief</b> 55:1
<b>act</b> 18:1 32:12 33:2,6,13,17 33:18,18,23 34:6,12 35:1 36:16	<b>adversarial</b> 52:21	<b>anxious</b> 103:8	<b>arrived</b> 95:19	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>beginning</b> 41:9 66:2 81:16 113:3	<b>bring</b> 34:25 50:7 <b>British</b> 47:9 101:19
<b>acted</b> 14:3 33:8 37:22 43:19 47:9,11,14	<b>advised</b> 2:16 28:17	<b>anybody</b> 2:22 14:19 32:18 34:6 51:8 87:5 93:25 104:19	<b>article</b> 2:22 3:20 5:10 8:11,16 42:12,13 57:17 57:21 58:7,12 68:18 69:14 70:3 96:18	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>beach</b> 70:22	<b>branch</b> 107:15
<b>acting</b> 20:17 21:15,21,22 32:5 34:10 39:14,15 42:9 47:2,13 50:16 50:18 58:10	<b>advisers</b> 67:3 74:11 84:10,15	<b>anyway</b> 74:9,12	<b>articles</b> 66:5,19 67:6 70:10 75:2 76:5 77:25 78:22 79:16 111:18	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>beast</b> 111:8	<b>breach</b> 8:16 15:10 17:1 23:2
<b>action</b> 9:11 17:18 21:10 51:17 66:22,25 67:4 69:8 71:21 78:5,18,25 79:19 81:7,11 81:12 82:10,10 83:2	<b>afternoon</b> 4:17	<b>apart</b> 50:14 81:10	<b>arrived</b> 95:19	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>beat</b> 52:24	<b>break</b> 11:25 34:15 46:21 56:22
<b>actions</b> 33:7 79:21,23	<b>age</b> 75:21	<b>apologies</b> 79:24 80:9,16,18 81:5	<b>article</b> 2:22 3:20 5:10 8:11,16 42:12,13 57:17 57:21 58:7,12 68:18 69:14 70:3 96:18	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>becoming</b> 76:3	<b>breaking</b> 35:25 <b>breakout</b> 32:25
<b>activity</b> 23:18 29:4	<b>agent</b> 40:5	<b>apologise</b> 2:12 9:3 97:19	<b>arrived</b> 95:19	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>beginning</b> 41:9 66:2 81:16 113:3	<b>brief</b> 55:1
<b>actual</b> 104:16	<b>agrieved</b> 69:21	<b>apologised</b> 32:1	<b>asked</b> 1:5 6:21 18:15 22:7 24:11 25:12 29:7 31:22 61:8 64:20 65:3 73:3,4,21 74:13 76:20 77:10 85:10 87:4 90:19 92:15 96:17 103:5 112:12	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>behalf</b> 17:18 25:15 38:3,3	<b>bring</b> 34:25 50:7 <b>British</b> 47:9 101:19
	<b>ago</b> 28:15 73:18 73:19 91:8 100:8 101:25	<b>apology</b> 50:23 80:4,11,22 97:8,18	<b>asking</b> 32:21,21 33:20 37:12 42:15 52:7 90:21,25 91:7	<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>belief</b> 12:23 63:14	<b>broad</b> 27:20 108:21
	<b>agree</b> 59:19 74:8 88:21 94:4	<b>appalling</b> 112:8		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>believe</b> 20:7 46:11 66:24 77:23 78:16 95:12 103:1 105:2 107:19 114:7	<b>broaden</b> 28:11 <b>broader</b> 109:2
	<b>agreed</b> 33:18 34:9 45:23 50:22 74:10 97:9	<b>apparently</b> 15:16		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>belonged</b> 27:4	<b>broke</b> 35:2 <b>Brooks</b> 43:7 44:7 58:19 59:1 84:1 96:17
	<b>agreeing</b> 22:21 34:11	<b>Appeal</b> 14:14 47:14		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>believed</b> 78:10 92:3	<b>brought</b> 14:6 37:25 38:5 50:19 54:3 69:20
	<b>agreement</b> 34:5 42:18	<b>Appeal's</b> 14:10		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5	<b>Bench</b> 49:8	
	<b>agreements</b> 50:5	<b>appeared</b> 105:5		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5		
	<b>Ah</b> 60:15	<b>appearing</b> 77:10		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5		
	<b>ahead</b> 10:2	<b>appears</b> 105:7 109:22 113:10 114:8		<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5		
	<b>aim</b> 53:15			<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5		
	<b>Alan</b> 114:2			<b>attracted</b> 76:24 <b>attracting</b> 35:5		

<b>brushed</b> 46:20	106:13	52:1,3,6	<b>clarifications</b>	<b>commencing</b>	59:24 61:14	25:13 96:16
<b>Bryant</b> 103:5	<b>carried</b> 29:12	<b>Chairman</b> 45:14	97:15,17	21:7	87:24	<b>continue</b> 15:7
<b>build</b> 23:21	<b>carry</b> 59:21	<b>challenge</b> 1:22	<b>clarifying</b> 105:18	<b>comment</b> 30:16	<b>conclusion</b> 40:10	76:13
<b>building</b> 101:23	61:21 62:3	2:1	<b>clarity</b> 58:23	43:15 67:19	59:15	<b>continued</b> 33:13
106:21	98:8	<b>challenged</b> 53:19	96:10	69:4 71:1	<b>conclusions</b>	64:23 76:11
<b>bull</b> 16:7	<b>carrying</b> 105:24	<b>Chamberlain</b>	<b>clear</b> 3:11 8:14	114:12	40:11	<b>continues</b> 65:12
<b>bullies</b> 54:1	<b>cars</b> 75:3	38:13,16	10:20 48:23	<b>commenting</b> 2:8	<b>conditional</b> 50:5	<b>continuing</b> 5:24
<b>bullying</b> 47:12	<b>case</b> 2:5 3:11	<b>chance</b> 55:8	58:4,24 87:17	<b>comments</b> 90:22	<b>condone</b> 74:6	<b>control</b> 45:5 46:2
<b>bundle</b> 67:8	5:17 9:5 14:10	67:19 77:21	96:21	112:7	<b>conduct</b> 13:16	112:17
70:15	14:17,21 15:9	112:14,14	<b>clearly</b> 5:4,5,23	<b>commercial</b>	65:6 70:16	<b>Convention</b> 8:17
<b>burn</b> 112:1	15:13,14,18,20	<b>change</b> 65:4	7:3 65:19	111:4	<b>conducted</b> 6:20	<b>conversation</b>
<b>bus</b> 34:12	16:12,25 21:4	72:13,15	<b>cleverer</b> 61:25	<b>Commission</b>	<b>conference</b> 38:10	21:13 25:1,4
<b>Buscombe</b> 37:6	22:8,24 23:17	<b>changed</b> 88:10	<b>cliche</b> 69:4	45:13,15 69:12	<b>confidences</b>	25:23 26:15,18
38:4,9	23:22,24 24:20	88:11,16 100:7	<b>client</b> 8:25 23:7	<b>Commissioner</b>	111:4	29:5,19,25
<b>Businesslike</b>	24:23 27:23	<b>changes</b> 81:3	24:12 28:17,19	24:18 38:20	<b>confidential</b> 6:11	30:4,19 33:1
57:10	29:10 30:2	<b>Channel</b> 101:22	52:15,15 58:15	<b>Committee</b>	10:13	38:17 39:24
<b>busy</b> 28:23	31:16 33:19,19	<b>characterise</b>	97:14	95:23	<b>confidentiality</b>	43:24 57:6,8
	39:21 50:9	46:13	<b>clients</b> 3:9 5:25	<b>Committees</b>	10:18	57:15,21,25
<b>C</b>	51:9 58:1 69:5	<b>charged</b> 19:12	6:16 7:7 28:1	13:14 37:4	<b>confined</b> 106:11	58:2 61:12,16
<b>C</b> 15:15,20 16:3	81:23 83:6,11	<b>charity</b> 64:16,18	34:18 35:6	<b>common</b> 79:12	<b>confirm</b> 30:4	<b>conversations</b>
<b>call</b> 4:22 31:16	87:6 92:3,6	<b>cheap</b> 52:16	40:13 61:14	<b>community-ba...</b>	38:15 63:13	35:21 82:6
36:18 39:10	102:19 105:5	<b>cheaper</b> 91:23	<b>client's</b> 18:16	102:3	97:4 99:10,22	<b>convictions</b>
58:15 60:23	105:14 107:7	<b>check</b> 68:16,17	<b>Clifford</b> 34:21	<b>compact</b> 26:14	<b>confirming</b> 59:7	20:10,15
100:9 105:19	112:22 114:6	<b>checking</b> 88:6	34:23 35:13,16	<b>company</b> 47:11	<b>confluence</b> 113:6	<b>convivial</b> 32:7
105:20,23,24	<b>cases</b> 28:10 32:9	<b>Chelsea</b> 48:3	<b>Clintons</b> 79:3	101:7,14	<b>confronted</b>	<b>cope</b> 37:13 60:9
106:18,19,21	47:3,18 49:2,6	<b>cherry</b> 12:3	<b>Clive</b> 20:10 24:1	102:25	17:22	<b>copy</b> 55:20 57:17
106:25 107:19	49:7,9,21 50:7	<b>chest</b> 7:1	<b>close</b> 72:19 73:9	<b>comparatively</b>	<b>confused</b> 110:16	<b>core</b> 1:7,13 37:1
108:25 109:10	53:8 58:2 69:5	<b>chief</b> 100:22	73:9 85:4	9:3	<b>connect</b> 23:24	98:16
109:13	69:7 79:25	101:12,13	<b>club</b> 47:12	<b>compared</b>	<b>conscious</b> 68:20	<b>correct</b> 12:14,15
<b>called</b> 16:6 17:11	80:13 81:19	<b>children</b> 64:1	<b>clue</b> 38:14	105:13	98:11	12:22 13:3,5
36:14 43:1,6	82:13 87:18	66:13 68:12	<b>coaching</b> 55:21	<b>competitor</b>	<b>consequence</b>	13:19,23 14:4
64:9 73:3	92:5 98:22	72:23 75:5,20	<b>Coalition</b> 53:25	43:12	1:12 36:24	15:1 17:13,17
101:20,22	104:25 107:7	75:23,24 76:6	<b>cock</b> 16:7	<b>complained</b>	45:18,24 89:14	17:20 18:12
102:1,2	<b>case-by-case</b> 2:4	77:6,17,18	<b>code</b> 45:9 104:14	79:18 91:11	<b>consequences</b>	21:4,17,18
<b>caller</b> 106:4	<b>cash</b> 35:23	78:17 83:21	<b>codes</b> 108:8	<b>complaining</b>	27:21 37:16	22:12 23:13
<b>calling</b> 43:9	<b>cast</b> 6:3	85:11,16,25	<b>coincidence</b> 15:4	79:16	92:25	24:20 25:8
<b>calls</b> 35:9 100:10	<b>category</b> 99:16	<b>children's</b> 65:10	15:24 16:18	<b>complaint</b> 4:3	<b>consider</b> 56:7	26:6,20 31:8
104:12,16,19	99:18	<b>chilling</b> 54:4,5	<b>colleague</b> 32:8	33:3,11,14,16	70:16 79:9	31:18,22 38:25
105:3,6,13,14	<b>caught</b> 29:3	<b>chit-chat</b> 57:13	<b>Collyer-Bristow</b>	33:21 34:3,13	110:21	64:3 74:3,15
106:6 107:3,21	<b>causal</b> 26:9	<b>choice</b> 44:18,19	10:19	68:8 69:12,16	<b>consideration</b>	83:13 89:10
107:22 109:14	<b>cause</b> 35:6 104:4	88:15	<b>column</b> 3:20	79:9 97:5	1:10 7:8	114:1
109:15,19,19	<b>caused</b> 49:12	<b>chose</b> 36:11	41:21 97:9,15	<b>Complaints</b>	<b>considered</b> 38:7	<b>corrected</b> 51:16
111:1	<b>caution</b> 6:7	43:18	97:16 101:17	45:13,15 69:12	85:4 97:18	<b>correction</b> 50:23
<b>camp</b> 71:9	<b>CD</b> 55:20	<b>chosen</b> 90:20	<b>come</b> 2:19 5:15	<b>complete</b> 86:7	114:13	97:8,10 100:13
<b>campaign</b> 64:21	<b>celebrities</b>	<b>Chris</b> 103:5	7:19 9:16	99:2	<b>considering</b>	<b>corrections</b> 97:9
102:3,5	113:17	<b>chronology</b> 5:24	21:16,24 23:5	<b>completely</b> 39:13	14:17	97:14,15,17
<b>campaigning</b>	<b>Celebrity</b> 77:11	8:5	29:17 35:10,19	46:1 49:21	<b>considers</b> 31:13	<b>correctly</b> 18:22
101:25	90:21	<b>circumstances</b>	35:24 37:18	92:21	37:18	90:15,17,23
<b>capacity</b> 13:8	<b>cent</b> 14:1 30:9,16	102:23	43:14 48:18	<b>complex</b> 5:6	<b>consistency</b>	111:5
<b>Caplan</b> 1:4,12,17	54:12,16,18	<b>civil</b> 13:17 20:21	62:13 63:1	53:11	110:9	<b>correspondent</b>
1:19,24 2:9	82:20,21	40:12	65:3 72:19	<b>comprised</b> 11:3	<b>constantly</b> 72:5	19:11 24:2
54:25 55:9,11	<b>centre</b> 73:16	<b>claim</b> 18:16,16	83:15 84:5,12	<b>computer</b> 108:6	86:2	101:2
55:16,19 56:1	80:21	20:21 21:1	99:16 100:12	<b>computing</b>	<b>contact</b> 68:17,25	<b>corruption</b> 46:16
56:4,10,14	<b>certain</b> 46:8,8,10	22:2 26:11	100:14 107:3	100:22 113:7	69:2,6 88:9,14	46:16
96:4,5,15,23	60:23 66:24	34:11,25 49:16	108:4 109:14	<b>conceive</b> 20:4	88:16	<b>cost</b> 52:6 53:1
98:5	<b>certainly</b> 5:3,17	50:18,19,22	109:16	<b>concentrate</b>	<b>contacting</b>	<b>costs</b> 18:15,16,19
<b>car</b> 71:9,23	13:10 39:15	54:6,16 83:5	<b>comes</b> 106:22	65:16	110:10	28:7,8,10
73:15	40:2,12 41:9	<b>claimant</b> 50:21	<b>comfortable</b>	<b>concern</b> 2:24 3:7	<b>contain</b> 67:17	29:16,16,17
<b>cardiologist</b>	43:24 57:10	52:24,25	19:23 99:9	4:7	<b>contained</b> 8:7,13	31:5,7,11,12
47:10	58:9 61:12	102:16	<b>coming</b> 3:6 12:2	<b>concerned</b> 6:22	25:19	49:18,21 50:3
<b>care</b> 8:10	88:23 93:6	<b>claimants</b> 33:13	22:5 62:18	19:14 24:21	<b>contains</b> 10:12	50:20 51:5
<b>career</b> 100:19	96:9 99:8	51:13 54:22	92:25 93:10	25:20 37:1	<b>content</b> 61:20	54:19 79:25
101:5	110:19	<b>claims</b> 49:23	109:20,21	60:22 61:18	<b>contention</b>	82:19,21,25
<b>careful</b> 10:8	<b>cetera</b> 21:23 22:3	50:13,15 54:3	110:3,13	62:20 78:1	109:18	83:9 92:18,18
57:13 60:7	23:18 52:23	54:12,15	<b>command</b> 11:17	89:17 92:24	<b>contents</b> 12:21	<b>cotton</b> 98:23
98:11	<b>CFA</b> 54:15	<b>clarification</b>	<b>commenced</b>	<b>concerning</b> 55:2	63:13	<b>counsel</b> 2:18
<b>carefully</b> 106:11	<b>CFA's</b> 47:13 50:3	94:24 96:15	14:23 21:3,4	<b>concerns</b> 37:14	<b>context</b> 5:11	10:15 11:8

20:16 52:18	58:5	<b>death</b> 72:14	<b>described</b> 58:21	49:21	85:10 86:15	<b>equally</b> 9:4
<b>County</b> 49:13,17	<b>dad</b> 88:15	<b>debate</b> 112:18	<b>describing</b> 41:23	<b>dispute</b> 25:24,25	96:21	<b>equivalent</b> 3:2
<b>couple</b> 57:1	<b>Daddy</b> 102:7	<b>decade</b> 13:20	<b>deserve</b> 99:17	32:14 54:10	<b>early</b> 12:25	<b>errors</b> 112:15
73:18,19 80:13	<b>daily</b> 39:20 41:19	17:10	<b>Despite</b> 74:22	<b>disputed</b> 32:16	28:16 67:25	<b>especially</b> 69:7
<b>course</b> 2:1,18	41:22 42:12,25	<b>decide</b> 16:1 49:2	<b>despots</b> 45:1	<b>disputes</b> 52:8	<b>easier</b> 22:21	75:16
3:19 7:20	43:14 57:18	62:4 77:15	<b>destination</b>	<b>disregard</b> 70:19	<b>Eastern</b> 45:1	<b>espousing</b> 47:25
10:16 12:20	58:21 81:10	78:22,25,25	106:23	<b>diverged</b> 89:17	<b>easy</b> 41:6,7 66:13	<b>essence</b> 60:24
21:3 27:6,10	97:14 100:25	<b>decided</b> 41:16	<b>detail</b> 1:25 26:2	<b>diversions</b> 52:24	66:14 83:2	<b>essentially</b>
54:10 64:6	101:3	49:7 66:19	37:7	<b>diverted</b> 31:4	86:10 98:24	106:19,24
68:14 70:11	<b>damages</b> 18:15	78:3,7 81:18	<b>detailed</b> 18:20	<b>Division</b> 49:8	113:18	108:23 111:11
78:5 80:3,20	18:17,19 28:12	103:4 111:22	54:19	<b>divorced</b> 63:25	<b>echoing</b> 97:24	<b>established</b> 88:6
80:23 103:14	29:15,16 49:12	<b>decides</b> 52:15	<b>details</b> 48:3	68:3 76:10,14	<b>echos</b> 44:16	<b>estate</b> 46:16
<b>court</b> 2:7 14:9,13	49:22 51:6,12	<b>decision</b> 2:2	<b>Detective</b> 38:18	<b>doctor</b> 50:19	<b>edited</b> 101:3	71:14 75:8
14:18 25:2,23	79:25 80:13	14:10 83:2	<b>deterrent</b> 89:2	<b>document</b> 6:13	<b>editor</b> 44:4 114:3	<b>et</b> 21:23 22:3
47:14 49:13,17	82:19	93:12	92:1,2,7,9,17	8:13 9:5 10:21	<b>editorial</b> 112:17	23:18 52:23
49:25 50:10,13	<b>Dan</b> 42:8	<b>decisions</b> 14:11	<b>develop</b> 6:23	<b>documented</b>	<b>Editors</b> 38:10	<b>ethics</b> 5:12
61:6 79:25	<b>danger</b> 102:10	<b>decisive</b> 7:21	<b>developed</b> 101:8	64:5	<b>effect</b> 2:25 27:9	108:13
80:5,7,12,15	<b>date</b> 28:8 30:1	<b>deduce</b> 105:20	<b>developments</b>	<b>documents</b> 9:22	28:9 30:11	<b>eureka</b> 19:15
81:20 82:13	57:14 100:1	<b>deductions</b> 104:9	37:10,21	10:25 11:3	36:20 54:4,5	20:12
83:16 86:18	<b>dated</b> 5:1 12:17	<b>deed</b> 36:6	<b>Diana's</b> 72:13	16:16 24:17	57:7	<b>European</b> 50:10
<b>courtesy</b> 1:9	<b>dates</b> 71:15	<b>deem</b> 3:2	<b>diaries</b> 108:24	27:8	<b>effective</b> 91:24	<b>evening</b> 35:22
11:24	<b>daughter</b> 75:16	<b>deeply</b> 2:15	109:11	<b>doing</b> 8:2 48:1	<b>effectively</b> 27:15	56:2 95:5,10
<b>courts</b> 48:22	102:7	<b>defamation</b> 13:4	<b>died</b> 19:20,22	53:11 71:24	38:16,22 39:17	101:17
49:7 54:22	<b>David</b> 10:14	50:18,19 53:1	<b>difference</b> 81:7	73:17 76:22	47:16 52:8	<b>event</b> 74:4
<b>coverage</b> 41:23	47:22	<b>defamatory</b> 87:2	103:25 109:8	102:12 111:14	<b>efforts</b> 26:3	<b>events</b> 5:13 6:8
43:13 44:2	<b>Davies</b> 2:10,12	<b>defame</b> 53:2	<b>differences</b> 37:4	111:15 112:5	<b>either</b> 59:2	106:2
58:21,22 76:11	3:19,24 6:9 7:7	86:16	<b>different</b> 11:24	113:17 114:7	<b>El</b> 31:20	<b>eventually</b> 43:8
<b>covering</b> 100:24	8:1,23 9:15,17	<b>defamed</b> 49:14	47:21 48:6	<b>domain</b> 8:21	<b>elaborate</b> 87:23	<b>everybody</b> 8:8
<b>covers</b> 1:17	9:20 10:3,6	51:14 87:12	51:14 58:20	56:15 76:24	<b>elder</b> 75:9	9:3 14:18
44:24	13:21 55:12	<b>default</b> 53:21	76:1,2 87:13	96:8,13	<b>eldest</b> 75:17	36:23 44:20
<b>crack</b> 11:19	59:10,14,21	<b>defence</b> 23:12	90:9	<b>domestic</b> 64:6,12	<b>Electronics</b>	48:22 51:24
<b>crawling</b> 73:1,6	60:4,5,7,10,13	24:11	<b>difficult</b> 47:18	64:16,18	100:23	<b>everyone's</b> 77:23
<b>crazy</b> 81:13	60:15,20 61:3	<b>defend</b> 54:3	51:18 53:8	<b>doorstep</b> 2:17,22	<b>element</b> 109:6	<b>evidence</b> 4:24
<b>create</b> 56:6	61:13,17,20	<b>defendant</b> 50:17	60:20 62:22	3:1	<b>Elizabeth</b> 55:2	5:14,20 6:24
<b>credibility</b> 26:12	62:2 84:20	50:19,22	68:15 85:25,25	<b>doorstepped</b>	<b>Elle</b> 34:22	7:4,6,17,19,22
<b>credible</b> 107:20	94:2,16,21,23	<b>defendants</b> 38:5	86:3 88:11	2:21	<b>email</b> 26:4,5,7,7	8:3 9:2 10:17
<b>credit</b> 28:14	95:2,21 96:1,3	47:9	91:6	<b>dot</b> 42:18	26:8 27:7	29:11,11 30:3
<b>crime</b> 40:8	97:3	<b>defending</b> 47:13	<b>difficulties</b> 35:6	<b>double</b> 80:21	110:12	31:2 37:3
<b>criminal</b> 34:21	<b>Davina</b> 101:9	86:2	60:24	<b>doubtless</b> 110:19	<b>emails</b> 38:15	38:17,21 40:6
62:9	<b>day</b> 1:5 2:12 5:1	<b>deferred</b> 1:11	<b>difficulty</b> 51:1	<b>Dowler</b> 42:6,10	<b>embarrassed</b>	40:7 41:12,13
<b>Crone</b> 18:7,18	19:24,24 36:18	<b>definitely</b> 23:20	52:11,12 59:22	42:11	71:2	41:17 44:1
19:5 21:16,23	36:19 78:12	72:21 81:14	104:4	<b>downstairs</b>	<b>emphasise</b> 13:8	47:6 55:20
31:19,20,25	100:3 104:21	<b>definition</b> 62:20	<b>dignified</b> 78:6	32:17 73:10	<b>employee</b> 55:24	56:5 58:25
32:2,8,16	<b>days</b> 1:14 28:8	65:24	11:10	<b>Dr</b> 4:19,19	56:2	59:2,3,4 62:8
<b>cross</b> 16:16	35:12 67:25	<b>degree</b> 6:7 8:10	<b>diminishing</b>	<b>draft</b> 99:22	<b>employees</b> 56:17	63:2 79:4
42:18	100:8	<b>deliberately</b> 8:2	11:10	<b>drafts</b> 112:6	<b>enabled</b> 41:5	81:25 82:1,1,2
<b>Crown</b> 24:19	<b>de</b> 47:22 75:8	<b>delicate</b> 8:19	<b>dinner</b> 38:10	<b>draw</b> 67:22	<b>ended</b> 35:10 69:3	82:4,7 87:7
<b>cryptic</b> 9:4	<b>deal</b> 6:14 7:9,12	<b>deliver</b> 1:8,15	<b>direct</b> 30:10,14	96:20 104:10	<b>Endemol</b> 101:7	94:24 95:2
<b>cul</b> 75:8	8:6,9 9:25	<b>delivered</b> 38:11	39:17 44:3,3	113:15	<b>enemies</b> 30:20	97:24 100:5
<b>culminated</b> 29:5	12:20 14:20	<b>delivering</b> 49:11	59:2	<b>drawing</b> 112:10	<b>energy</b> 48:24,24	105:18 106:7
<b>culmination</b> 33:3	25:22 44:9	<b>demanding</b>	<b>directions</b> 90:9	<b>drawn</b> 2:24 8:23	<b>engage</b> 112:18	106:11 107:17
<b>culture</b> 108:13	51:11,21,21	16:14	<b>disagree</b> 59:17	53:9	<b>engaged</b> 47:24	107:18 108:1
112:8 113:22	56:11 62:5	<b>demonstrably</b>	59:19 87:18	<b>drink</b> 32:18,19	<b>engaging</b> 79:10	110:23 113:22
114:4	90:2 91:16	88:5	<b>disaster</b> 35:18	32:20	<b>England</b> 35:12	114:1,1,14
<b>curious</b> 15:3,24	93:19,21 102:2	<b>demonstrate</b>	<b>disc</b> 26:14	<b>drive</b> 46:7	<b>English</b> 63:21	<b>evidence-based</b>
16:18	102:4,6 110:24	103:22	<b>disclosed</b> 10:14	<b>driver</b> 34:10	<b>ensure</b> 4:9 9:4	40:10,11
<b>curiously</b> 16:3	<b>dealing</b> 30:17,23	<b>demonstrates</b>	<b>disclosure</b> 24:16	<b>driving</b> 41:9	<b>enter</b> 85:3	<b>evidential</b>
<b>currency</b> 8:16	39:6 59:13	83:12 106:16	24:24 25:9,12	71:13,14	<b>entered</b> 34:5	108:22,23
<b>curtains</b> 48:12	69:9 73:11,20	<b>denial</b> 26:12	26:3	<b>drop</b> 50:22	<b>entire</b> 68:1	<b>ex</b> 15:19
48:13,17 73:8	94:6 95:24	27:15	<b>discover</b> 111:2,3	<b>drove</b> 71:22 72:8	<b>entirely</b> 7:11	<b>exactly</b> 6:16
73:9	109:4	<b>denied</b> 23:14,15	<b>discovered</b>	<b>duck</b> 112:4	9:19 88:21	11:23 30:4
<b>custom</b> 5:12	<b>deals</b> 5:2,5 57:5	<b>denying</b> 21:8	102:20	<b>due</b> 12:20 21:3	108:17	39:4 88:8
	58:18 70:14	<b>depends</b> 41:13	44:10	102:17	<b>entirety</b> 34:14	106:8 107:16
	82:25	52:20 94:18,19	<b>discussion</b> 1:3	<b>dwell</b> 37:6	<b>entitled</b> 18:19	109:13
	<b>dealt</b> 16:12 22:1	<b>descending</b> 4:8	11:15 59:14		54:21 90:11	<b>examined</b> 16:11
	33:17 39:12	<b>describe</b> 36:12	95:1		<b>equal</b> 27:24	<b>example</b> 47:21
	49:23 81:5	57:10	<b>disproportionate</b>		<b>equality</b> 50:10	52:14 54:14
				<b>E</b>		
				<b>earlier</b> 47:6		



70:20	83:3	<b>fewer</b> 81:9	<b>following</b> 2:25	19:7 31:1 32:5	108:24 109:11	<b>grateful</b> 9:9,14
<b>examples</b> 70:16	<b>ex-wife</b> 16:15	<b>field</b> 50:14	71:22 72:5,20	33:20 37:10,21	<b>go</b> 6:12 22:4 26:2	60:17 62:17,25
<b>excellent</b> 104:23	63:20	<b>fight</b> 54:20,21	73:16 75:3	56:24 59:22	29:17 31:10	87:23 93:13
<b>excesses</b> 112:9	<b>eye</b> 62:21 65:11	78:14	<b>follows</b> 3:8 52:20	66:17 67:7	32:3 40:25	99:19 100:4
<b>exchange</b> 60:12	74:11 79:12	<b>figure</b> 22:10 29:7	<b>foot</b> 82:14	97:3 100:6	45:2,22 46:9,9	106:12
107:15	89:25 90:1	29:13 43:18	<b>football</b> 28:2	<b>furthermore</b>	48:10 51:20	<b>great</b> 3:11 6:14
<b>exchanged</b> 22:20	93:6	<b>file</b> 57:11	48:3 95:14	2:21	58:14 62:24,25	28:13 75:15
<b>excuse</b> 88:4		<b>filled</b> 99:9	<b>footballer</b> 48:6		66:5 67:15	<b>greatest</b> 14:13
<b>executive</b> 101:12	<b>F</b>	<b>financially</b> 82:18	63:21 65:22		69:23 75:9,11	<b>greedy</b> 42:5,14
101:13	<b>fabricated</b> 92:21	<b>financing</b> 101:21	89:13	<b>game</b> 101:8	75:12,13 79:4	54:15
<b>exhibit</b> 6:11 9:21	<b>face</b> 29:8 30:24	<b>find</b> 4:4 8:8 41:2	<b>Footballers</b>	<b>GARNHAM</b>	83:16,21 85:17	<b>Greenberg</b> 95:5
10:10,12	30:24 41:24,25	50:12 56:11	13:25	60:3 98:5	87:6 90:20	95:6,7,10,13
<b>exhibits</b> 67:7,14	<b>fact</b> 3:13 22:5	66:1 67:7	<b>forget</b> 32:20	<b>Garry</b> 14:3 15:9	91:9 97:8	95:19,22
<b>exist</b> 40:7	35:5 40:6	70:13,18 74:18	<b>forgets</b> 92:6	15:14 16:9,25	100:6 108:3,15	<b>grey</b> 87:12
<b>existed</b> 69:17	44:20 45:15	74:18,23 83:16	<b>forgiven</b> 97:23	48:7	110:11 111:22	<b>grin</b> 39:4
<b>exists</b> 107:13,20	46:21 49:6	83:23 87:19	<b>form</b> 5:15 40:7	<b>Gascoigne</b> 4:16	112:3	<b>grinned</b> 39:2
<b>expect</b> 2:3 97:16	51:8 67:23	88:12 93:7	45:11	62:13,15,16	<b>goalposts</b> 28:3,4	<b>Group</b> 21:1,5,15
<b>expected</b> 1:23	72:1 80:13	106:25 110:9	<b>formalisation</b>	63:6,21 64:5	<b>goes</b> 2:19 50:8	27:4,8 31:6
<b>expel</b> 36:10	91:15 100:7,13	<b>finding</b> 70:23	50:25	64:11 65:7	91:13	32:11,22,23
<b>expelled</b> 36:3,6,7	100:16 109:9	<b>fine</b> 84:22	<b>formats</b> 101:8	67:11 89:8	<b>going</b> 5:18 8:10	42:14
<b>expense</b> 52:9	110:5,6 114:9	<b>finish</b> 38:23 86:8	<b>formed</b> 12:5	<b>gather</b> 90:7	9:24 10:17	<b>Guardian</b> 2:13
<b>expenses</b> 46:17	<b>facts</b> 47:20 68:16	<b>finished</b> 38:25	<b>Fortunately</b>	<b>general</b> 3:10	11:6 19:7	2:25 3:6,17,25
<b>expensive</b> 48:23	68:17 109:9	<b>firm</b> 13:1,22,24	83:11	6:20 39:22,23	24:10 26:16	4:2 34:15
83:4 111:21	<b>factual</b> 3:7 79:3	20:17 21:15	<b>Fortune</b> 101:22	58:7,9 63:20	27:22 32:5	35:20 97:4
<b>experience</b> 16:12	91:18 112:15	35:9	<b>fortunes</b> 89:16	103:21	34:25 37:18	114:3
47:2 62:10	<b>fail</b> 69:5	<b>first</b> 2:20 4:15	<b>forward</b> 26:13	<b>generally</b> 14:21	44:9 45:1	<b>guest</b> 38:9
69:11,16 79:11	<b>failed</b> 44:4	8:4 12:16	54:8 65:4	42:1 67:23	46:17 47:17,18	<b>guide</b> 101:23
86:13	<b>failure</b> 68:16	13:17 34:23	102:1	<b>generic</b> 2:6	49:1,2 52:13	<b>guilty</b> 19:10,13
<b>experiences</b>	<b>fair</b> 4:10 8:25 9:4	43:25 53:21	<b>forwards</b> 112:21	<b>geography</b> 44:25	53:8,9 56:19	<b>gun</b> 23:19 27:13
98:17	14:11 44:24	55:7 57:4 61:8	<b>found</b> 41:7 42:8	<b>George</b> 13:21	59:18,23 60:7	<b>Guy</b> 69:18
<b>expert</b> 112:13	<b>fairly</b> 73:14	63:16 70:17	67:20 68:15	<b>germane</b> 102:12	61:1,3 62:5,18	
<b>expertise</b> 113:4	<b>fall</b> 98:15	73:22 80:2	112:18	<b>getting</b> 15:23	63:16 65:6,16	<b>H</b>
<b>explain</b> 6:7 15:11	<b>falls</b> 108:17	84:24 85:17,23	<b>four</b> 101:19	35:23 71:23	70:13 71:24	<b>hack</b> 26:19 55:22
63:22 66:1,18	<b>false</b> 22:22	86:16 87:25	<b>fourth</b> 46:16	89:11 108:9	72:1,3,10 76:9	95:4
66:20 71:20	<b>family</b> 47:25	88:18 95:9	<b>four-figure</b>	112:10	77:8 78:4,6	<b>hacked</b> 13:13
85:18 95:21	86:12	98:2 100:17	50:21	<b>giant</b> 3:2	79:13,17 83:16	19:4 102:21
106:17	<b>famous</b> 65:22	102:5,24 104:2	<b>France</b> 101:24	<b>Gillian</b> 92:5	84:7,13 86:18	107:21 113:9
<b>explained</b> 57:24	111:13	104:5	<b>free</b> 102:13	<b>girl</b> 15:4,15,21	87:13,18 89:13	<b>hacking</b> 13:6,9
<b>explanation</b> 16:4	<b>fans</b> 47:12	<b>firstly</b> 5:7 66:20	<b>freedom</b> 46:4,5,6	15:22,25 16:3	90:17 91:17	13:12,16,18
16:17 17:7	<b>fantastic</b> 78:13	112:8	46:7,14 47:5	16:7	95:3 104:3	15:3 18:24
18:7,13,25	<b>far</b> 19:14 24:21	<b>first-hand</b> 16:11	<b>freelance</b> 71:8	<b>gist</b> 26:17 42:13	105:16,19	19:10 20:23
19:1 20:4	51:20 68:5,5	<b>fish</b> 112:24	101:15	<b>give</b> 1:9 7:7,19	106:13 107:10	25:11 32:6,12
27:25 28:1	82:23,23	<b>fisherman</b>	<b>freelancer</b> 111:8	8:15 10:19	107:16 112:15	33:13,24 34:16
<b>explore</b> 114:11	110:21	112:24	<b>Frequently</b> 10:6	25:5 30:3 31:1	112:21 113:10	34:18 35:5
<b>explored</b> 15:13	<b>Farrer</b> 21:15	<b>fishing</b> 111:16	<b>fresh</b> 7:24	40:21 47:3,20	113:13	37:10,23 39:20
<b>exposed</b> 48:16	<b>Farrers</b> 24:13,21	<b>fit</b> 56:16 93:17	<b>Friday</b> 35:22,22	55:4 62:8 63:2	<b>gold</b> 111:21	39:25 40:17,20
<b>exposes</b> 46:15	29:2 33:25	<b>five</b> 34:20 55:14	<b>friend</b> 31:20 32:2	65:3 72:2,7	<b>good</b> 36:6,7,7	40:21,21 41:4
<b>exposing</b> 46:16	<b>fascinating</b>	56:19 91:7	32:8 85:5	78:11 79:15	46:15,19 48:5	58:6 103:7
46:18,18 47:23	25:18	<b>flak</b> 112:5	<b>friendly</b> 30:21	80:25 86:6	48:14,16,18	105:1,9,11
48:1	<b>fashion</b> 10:9	<b>Fleet</b> 31:21	57:9	100:12	62:9 63:4	109:6,10
<b>expressed</b> 37:14	<b>fast</b> 102:5	<b>flew</b> 84:25	<b>friends</b> 85:6 86:1	<b>given</b> 1:17 6:19	82:15 85:4	112:24 113:23
<b>expressing</b> 90:7	<b>father</b> 19:20,22	<b>Flitcroft</b> 14:3,5	<b>friendship</b> 84:3,5	7:6 16:18	99:5	114:4
<b>expression</b> 47:5	88:14	14:25 15:13,14	85:1,2,4	18:25 27:25	<b>Goodman</b> 20:10	<b>half</b> 3:19 10:2
48:9	<b>fault</b> 99:21	16:9 48:7	<b>front</b> 2:14 3:20	37:3 38:21	24:1	<b>halfway</b> 81:12
<b>expressly</b> 23:16	<b>feature</b> 101:1	<b>Flitcroft's</b> 15:9	63:8 72:24	52:10 55:20	<b>Gordan</b> 19:21	<b>Hampton</b> 12:13
<b>expulsion</b> 36:8	<b>February</b> 57:18	16:25	75:4 80:21	80:24 81:6	<b>Gordon</b> 17:16	13:2
<b>extend</b> 11:7,23	<b>fed</b> 81:17 82:6	<b>flurry</b> 29:4	97:5	97:25	19:9,10,21	<b>hand</b> 38:13
<b>extending</b> 10:20	<b>fee</b> 50:5	<b>flying</b> 35:10	<b>fuelled</b> 77:12	<b>gives</b> 51:1	20:13,20 24:2	<b>Handed</b> 3:21
<b>extension</b> 106:21	<b>feel</b> 40:1 66:20	<b>focus</b> 65:18	<b>full</b> 12:10,11	<b>give-away</b> 21:21	24:2 27:25	57:22
<b>extensions</b>	76:4 85:15,18	<b>focused</b> 114:12	18:25 63:5	<b>giving</b> 63:1 76:17	34:4,4,9,21,25	<b>handful</b> 25:10
107:22,23	86:1,1 93:7	<b>follow</b> 20:21	99:10	112:17	35:20	<b>hands</b> 7:11 42:20
<b>extensive</b> 74:22	94:21 102:13	71:9 72:18	<b>fund</b> 83:9	<b>glass</b> 99:9	<b>government</b>	73:1,6 74:9
<b>extent</b> 2:23 5:6	<b>feels</b> 94:18,19	75:14 100:5	<b>funeral</b> 19:22	<b>Gleneagles</b> 73:1	47:24	<b>hang</b> 25:6
6:12,22 8:11	<b>felt</b> 66:3 69:21	<b>followed</b> 15:20	<b>funny</b> 20:5 57:12	<b>Glenn</b> 19:9 20:10	<b>grabber</b> 66:4	<b>happen</b> 40:8
60:23 74:8	77:7 80:8 82:9	17:24 71:6	<b>further</b> 1:7,14	21:5 23:24	<b>Grant</b> 109:7	44:14 45:21
<b>extremely</b> 3:10	82:14 112:11	73:15 76:5	5:20 7:17	24:4 26:16	<b>graphically</b>	48:12 72:3,10
4:9 5:4 48:23	<b>fence</b> 54:13	91:8	15:13 16:17	40:5 55:21	36:12	86:19,19

<b>happened</b> 17:8 19:7,8 25:8 32:23 35:19 42:7 43:17 50:24 95:12 97:23 107:25 110:16	<b>high-option</b> 51:2 <b>high-worth</b> 113:16 <b>hindsight</b> 14:23 30:19 84:13 <b>hired</b> 111:10 <b>historic</b> 7:23 <b>history</b> 10:24 79:8 <b>hit</b> 84:25 112:5 <b>hold</b> 64:8 76:8 <b>holiday</b> 35:8,11 70:22 71:1 <b>home</b> 35:12,24 73:8 83:17 <b>hone</b> 110:23 <b>hope</b> 8:8 61:3 86:10 92:14 93:2 98:15 112:4 <b>hopefully</b> 63:8 65:4 72:7 78:16 <b>hoping</b> 83:20 <b>horrific</b> 92:4 <b>horse</b> 22:17,18 <b>Hoskins</b> 2:17,20 62:12 63:3,4 67:11,14 75:1 93:16,23 94:6 94:9,12 <b>host</b> 114:1 <b>hour</b> 41:10,10 <b>house</b> 71:9,10 72:22 75:5 83:9,14 91:25 113:17 <b>houses</b> 101:23 <b>housing</b> 71:14 75:8 <b>Hovell</b> 35:14 36:15 <b>huge</b> 53:1 65:1 82:1 89:24 92:1,7 <b>Hughes</b> 34:22 <b>Hunt</b> 45:14 <b>hurtful</b> 67:18,21 68:11,12 88:12 88:13 <b>husband</b> 90:7 <b>hypocrisy</b> 48:1	<b>impact</b> 75:1,5 76:4 82:11 85:10 114:17 114:19 <b>impacted</b> 85:15 <b>importance</b> 96:1 <b>important</b> 5:23 7:4,22 8:22 26:2,23 40:16 53:16 62:22 80:5,6,7,12 83:1 95:21 103:25 110:9 <b>inaccurate</b> 2:23 68:9,13 76:18 88:24 <b>incident</b> 72:25 <b>included</b> 13:24 41:23 <b>incorrect</b> 97:7 <b>increased</b> 26:10 <b>incurred</b> 52:9 <b>indicate</b> 71:15 <b>indicated</b> 10:9 17:23 106:4 <b>indicates</b> 64:9 83:25 <b>individual</b> 18:2 39:15 55:23 58:11 96:13 <b>individuals</b> 113:16 <b>industry</b> 45:25 46:1 95:14 <b>inequality</b> 52:13 52:19 <b>inevitable</b> 11:16 110:7 <b>inevitably</b> 52:22 <b>inexorably</b> 45:4 <b>infer</b> 105:24 <b>inference</b> 2:24 23:17 96:20 113:24 114:10 <b>inferences</b> 23:21 41:15 <b>inferential</b> 23:21 23:24 41:17 <b>information</b> 5:8 10:13 24:18 27:14 41:14 96:7 104:9 106:24 107:1 110:10 113:19 <b>informed</b> 102:24 <b>infringed</b> 51:15 <b>ingrained</b> 114:4 <b>initial</b> 15:18 <b>initially</b> 15:13 21:10 29:8 33:8 34:19,20 <b>initiate</b> 22:16 <b>initiated</b> 21:1 <b>injunction</b> 15:10 15:18,19 17:1 17:3,4,19 <b>injury</b> 34:11	53:12 <b>Inmos</b> 101:21 <b>innocence</b> 81:21 <b>innocent</b> 107:22 109:19,23 110:3 111:2 <b>inquiries</b> 18:10 19:6 <b>inquiry</b> 3:3,9,10 3:13 4:8 5:16 6:3,20,21 7:5 10:15 11:8 12:9,16 18:18 18:21 20:9 28:15 39:2 40:5 41:12 44:15,18 45:21 52:12 62:23 63:5,7 67:16 80:4 83:1 85:14 95:24 97:19 102:11 103:9 104:5 108:2,21 110:25 113:25 114:11 <b>Inquiry's</b> 59:24 67:22 <b>inside</b> 106:21 107:23 109:14 109:17 <b>insights</b> 103:10 <b>insofar</b> 103:15 <b>instance</b> 109:15 <b>instructed</b> 24:5 35:15 58:11,12 95:3 <b>instructing</b> 3:9 24:4 52:17 <b>instruction</b> 35:16 <b>instructions</b> 4:4 40:13 97:6 <b>insurance</b> 50:3,6 52:4 <b>intelligence</b> 114:5 <b>intending</b> 16:21 18:4 <b>intention</b> 8:15 <b>intercepted</b> 103:1 <b>interception</b> 41:5 102:16 <b>interest</b> 65:20 74:7 77:12,14 113:12,14,16 <b>interested</b> 65:23 65:24 81:3 114:16 <b>interesting</b> 46:20 <b>interestingly</b> 86:24 <b>interests</b> 96:10 <b>International</b> 2:16 6:1 9:5,23 10:21,25 23:10	23:12 42:10,20 95:8,19,23 100:10 103:18 105:1,10 107:23 109:17 <b>International's</b> 27:8 <b>Internet</b> 38:12 101:13 <b>interpretation</b> 85:21 <b>interrupt</b> 104:2 106:17 <b>interview</b> 111:25 <b>interviews</b> 74:14 <b>intimate</b> 74:4 <b>introduced</b> 69:18 79:7 <b>introduction</b> 63:18 64:9 104:24 <b>intrusion</b> 73:13 85:12 <b>intrusive</b> 10:12 70:17 91:1 <b>invade</b> 53:4 <b>invaded</b> 49:14 <b>invasion</b> 20:22 51:3 53:4 <b>investigate</b> 8:12 8:24 <b>investigated</b> 19:2 <b>investigation</b> 18:20 19:3 <b>investigations</b> 14:23 <b>investments</b> 111:20,20 <b>invite</b> 74:6 <b>invited</b> 1:22 <b>inviting</b> 113:25 <b>involve</b> 61:15 <b>involved</b> 14:17 15:9 16:19,25 31:6 39:20 50:4 58:1,6 64:19 65:2 95:15 96:7 106:24 111:13 111:23 <b>involving</b> 103:12 <b>in-house</b> 16:13 39:11,11 <b>ironic</b> 113:8 <b>irrecoverable</b> 89:19 <b>Israel</b> 35:11,11 <b>issue</b> 8:24 13:16 13:18 18:20 33:23 40:17 42:23 44:8 45:24 56:12 66:8 81:4 86:17 94:13 110:19 114:9 <b>issued</b> 21:11,12 <b>issues</b> 4:7 5:6,10	5:24 7:2 8:11 25:20 50:1 53:9 60:6,8,9 64:17 87:15,19 <b>Italy</b> 84:6,6,9,12 84:21 <b>i's</b> 42:18 <hr/> <b>J</b> <hr/> <b>Jack</b> 15:19 <b>jacket</b> 99:7 <b>James</b> 31:2 <b>January</b> 13:23 95:14 102:17 <b>Jay</b> 60:17 61:5,8 61:11 93:23 94:3,5,6,13,16 94:20 98:8,9 98:13,19,21,24 98:25 99:2,8 99:13,20,21 103:23 109:7 110:6,23 111:6 114:18 <b>jibe</b> 42:4 <b>jigsaw</b> 40:22 <b>Joanne</b> 17:12,15 18:1 19:20 33:7 <b>job</b> 81:21,22 101:13 <b>John</b> 38:20,21,24 <b>joined</b> 13:21 15:21 <b>joint</b> 35:15 <b>journalism</b> 46:15,19 101:14 113:4 <b>journalist</b> 15:5,8 16:5,24 17:2,5 20:2 39:25 40:19,25 53:19 58:3 95:2,4,7 95:16,17 96:6 99:15 100:18 100:19,20 <b>journalistic</b> 18:10,17 19:6 <b>journalists</b> 16:19 41:7 45:7,9 46:4 110:8 113:23 <b>journalist's</b> 81:21 <b>judge</b> 31:12 41:16 81:2 <b>judged</b> 3:15 <b>judgment</b> 1:9 50:9 53:18,20 <b>judgments</b> 53:17 <b>judicial</b> 52:23 <b>Julian</b> 21:14 24:9 29:5 30:20 31:24,24 32:15,23 33:1 <b>July</b> 36:19 95:10 95:14	<b>junior</b> 2:18 <b>jurisprudence</b> 50:9 <b>jury</b> 82:13 <b>justice</b> 1:4,16,20 1:25 2:11 3:3 3:16,22,25 4:6 4:14,19,21,25 5:22 6:5,19 7:13,16,20,25 8:19 9:8,10,13 9:15,18 10:2,4 10:10,14,23 11:2,6,14,19 11:23 12:7 14:15,16 15:19 25:17 31:10,15 36:22 37:11 40:9 44:13,17 44:24 46:25 47:1 48:15,20 50:1,11 52:5 52:20 53:3,6 54:23 55:7,10 55:14,18,25 56:4,11,18 57:3 59:4,18 60:4,6,8,11,14 60:16 61:1,5 61:10,17,21 62:3,9,14,16 67:9,13 74:25 86:23,24 87:5 87:9 88:4,8 88:21 89:5,18 89:16,23 90:3 90:6,24 91:4 91:13,19,23 92:11,23 93:2 93:5,10,12,15 93:20,24 94:4 94:8,10,13,19 94:22,25 95:20 95:25 96:2,4 96:14,20,24 97:2,22 98:4,7 98:10,14,20,24 99:1,5,14,19 102:17 108:11 109:1,25 110:18 114:17 114:19 <b>justify</b> 2:6 <hr/> <b>K</b> <hr/> <b>keen</b> 56:5 84:10 <b>keep</b> 62:21 78:5 84:11 93:6 <b>Kelly</b> 101:9 <b>Kent</b> 102:4 <b>kept</b> 8:21 40:6 <b>key</b> 109:12 <b>kilter</b> 14:10 51:10 <b>kind</b> 66:4 68:6 69:24 71:17 73:13 75:13
---	--	--	--	---	---	---

79:12 82:16	110:2	11:23 12:7	<b>lift</b> 64:10	<b>looking</b> 26:9	112:13	6:3 7:21 20:8
90:2 91:10,11	<b>larger</b> 105:17	14:15,16 25:17	<b>light</b> 6:3 18:23	30:19 36:1	<b>lots</b> 23:21 75:11	21:17 26:1
<b>King</b> 24:2	<b>latched</b> 66:3	31:10,15 36:22	110:20 114:13	39:7 41:20	82:22	35:18 39:1,13
<b>knees</b> 73:1,6	<b>late</b> 103:11	37:11 40:9	<b>lightbulb</b> 19:14	43:5 54:16	<b>lounge</b> 73:10	54:21 55:16
<b>knew</b> 15:2 16:8	<b>law</b> 13:4 46:12	44:13,17,24	<b>limb</b> 8:3	85:13 104:8,10	<b>love</b> 66:16	58:11 59:21
20:2 27:2 31:2	46:22 48:22	46:25 47:1	<b>limited</b> 73:13	108:12,14	<b>loving</b> 71:1	86:25 87:1
83:18 84:9,15	50:14 51:23,25	48:15,20 50:11	95:7,16,17	109:8 111:16	<b>low</b> 105:12	94:23 96:1,6
103:6 112:13	62:9 86:25	52:5,20 53:3,6	<b>line</b> 8:20 33:20	<b>looks</b> 16:17	<b>lower</b> 54:20	96:11,15 97:1
<b>knocked</b> 31:12	87:1	54:23 55:7,10	39:17 53:9	<b>Lord</b> 1:4,12,16	<b>lowering</b> 49:18	100:7 113:15
<b>know</b> 2:15 6:16	<b>lawn</b> 72:24	55:14,18,25	98:11	1:20,25 2:11	<b>luckier</b> 41:2	<b>matters</b> 5:7,19
7:8 11:2 18:23	<b>lawyer</b> 18:8 35:1	56:4,11,18	<b>lines</b> 8:23 89:9	3:3,16,22,25	<b>lucky</b> 82:20,20	38:8 55:1,2
19:7 20:19	35:16 42:6,14	57:3 59:4,18	<b>link</b> 26:9 58:25	4:6,14,19,21	<b>lunch</b> 17:15	62:20 110:8
26:24 32:16	42:22,25 47:9	60:4,6,8,11,14	96:22	4:25 5:22 6:5	31:23,25 32:15	111:2,4
33:12 39:18	49:4,5 51:12	60:16 61:1,5	<b>linked</b> 8:4 59:3,3	6:19 7:13,16	93:18	<b>Max</b> 34:21,23
41:25 43:7	58:10,14 79:8	61:10,17,21	<b>linking</b> 19:13	7:20,25 8:19	<b>luncheon</b> 114:23	35:13,16
44:1,3 45:10	<b>lawyers</b> 16:13,13	62:3,9,14,16	<b>links</b> 44:1	9:8,10,13,15	<b>lunchtime</b> 4:5	<b>McCall</b> 101:10
46:6 50:2,8	22:17 25:17	67:9,13 74:25	<b>list</b> 79:15	9:18 10:2,4,10		<b>McCann</b> 4:18,19
51:3 54:13	27:19 49:20	86:23,24 87:5	<b>listen</b> 78:15	10:14,23 11:2	<b>M</b>	<b>McLibel</b> 50:8
59:18 60:24	51:23 54:15	87:9 88:4,18	<b>listening</b> 27:19	11:6,14,19,23	<b>Maberly</b> 25:2,24	<b>meal</b> 32:3
61:13 65:4	79:3 82:3 87:4	88:21 89:5,8	104:15 105:25	12:7 14:15,16	38:18	<b>mean</b> 6:17 8:22
66:10,25 67:23	103:6	89:16,23 90:3	106:6 109:3	25:17 31:10,15	<b>machine</b> 35:24	9:2 21:25
68:3,5,21,24	<b>lead</b> 37:15 49:17	90:6,24 91:4	<b>litigation</b> 5:25	36:22 37:11	<b>Macpherson</b>	23:11 28:25
69:17,17,22	97:10	91:13,19,23	13:17 14:6,20	40:9 44:13,17	34:22	30:10 40:7
70:9,25 72:17	<b>leader</b> 97:16	92:11,23 93:2	27:6 28:3,16	44:24 45:14	<b>magazine</b> 73:25	41:6,11 45:23
72:22 74:16,19	<b>leading</b> 11:8	93:5,10,12,15	50:17 52:6,24	46:25 47:1	84:16	49:3 50:11
75:15,22,24	52:18	93:20,24 94:4	53:1,12 54:8	48:15,20 50:11	<b>magazines</b>	52:25 53:20
76:6,7,7 77:20	<b>leads</b> 45:4 48:20	94:8,10,13,19	102:16	52:5,20 53:3,6	101:15	72:15,25 78:19
77:22,25 78:12	50:6 111:16	94:22,25 95:20	<b>little</b> 27:20 60:20	54:23 55:7,10	<b>Mail</b> 39:20 41:19	79:11 80:20
79:5 80:11,21	<b>learn</b> 98:17	95:25 96:2,4	64:15 69:15	55:14,18,25	41:22 42:12,25	81:8 84:3
81:18,25 82:1	<b>learning</b> 20:14	96:14,20,24	82:9 100:17	56:4,11,18	43:14 57:18	92:18 106:2,7
82:3,5,18,18	<b>learnt</b> 104:8	97:2,22 98:4,7	102:10 108:3	57:3 59:4,18	58:21 101:16	106:9 108:19
83:16,20 84:8	106:14	98:10,14,20,24	111:9	60:4,6,8,11,14	111:7,8	109:6 112:20
84:13 85:24	<b>leave</b> 95:18	99:1,5,14,19	<b>lived</b> 72:22,23	60:16 61:1,5	<b>mailbox</b> 106:5	114:2
86:13,17 88:8	<b>leaver</b> 36:6,7,7	108:11 109:1	75:7	61:10,17,21	<b>maintenance</b>	<b>meaning</b> 13:12
88:12 90:14,18	<b>led</b> 14:23 22:22	109:25 110:18	<b>lives</b> 65:10,11	62:3,9,14,16	108:8	<b>means</b> 7:8 65:23
90:21 91:9	38:1 39:3	114:17,19	74:8	67:9,13 74:25	<b>making</b> 22:14	74:5
92:5,6,18 93:4	66:24 77:19,23	<b>Leveson's</b> 3:3	<b>living</b> 48:21	86:23,24 87:5	69:11,16 79:9	<b>meant</b> 27:24
93:7,8,20,20	<b>left</b> 19:20,25	<b>Lewis</b> 4:16 5:1,8	101:24	87:9 88:4,18	105:13	29:23 41:13,25
93:21 94:8,8	22:14,18,23	5:20 6:2 7:4,6	<b>Liz</b> 39:10 57:6	88:21 89:5,8	<b>manage</b> 61:24,25	<b>mechanism</b>
94:14 95:11	32:8 71:10	8:6 9:1,12	<b>locate</b> 83:18	89:16,23 90:3	<b>Management</b>	48:25 50:12
100:18 104:2	84:6,9,21	11:21,22,23	<b>log</b> 100:9 106:25	90:6,24 91:4	95:22	53:18 56:11
106:15 108:6,7	95:10 101:5	12:9,11 25:17	107:4,19	91:13,19,23	<b>manager</b> 105:9	<b>mechanisms</b>
108:8,9 110:8	112:22	25:23 36:2,25	109:10,13	92:11,23 93:2	<b>managing</b> 35:14	52:7
111:14,22	<b>legal</b> 23:10 28:10	37:12 47:1	<b>logger</b> 106:19	93:5,10,12,15	36:14 79:24	<b>media</b> 60:23 74:7
114:5	31:7 47:21	53:6 55:5,19	<b>logging</b> 106:18	93:20,24 94:4	<b>Manchester</b>	76:11,25 82:2
<b>knowledge</b> 3:12	81:7 82:10	55:23 57:2,4	<b>logs</b> 103:17,19	94:8,10,13,19	13:22 21:24	85:12
12:22 26:22	83:2,9 103:4	59:6 62:6	103:21 108:25	94:22,25 95:20	35:3,7 36:4	<b>mediate</b> 50:12
44:3,6 63:14	<b>legitimate</b> 19:3	86:15 87:11	<b>London</b> 12:14	95:25 96:2,4	49:4,13,13,17	<b>mediated</b> 50:15
79:12 102:23	<b>legitimately</b>	95:2,5,11	22:19 31:22	96:14,20,24	<b>mantra</b> 108:13	<b>mediation</b> 50:20
103:9	108:4	<b>Lewis's</b> 4:23	35:13 37:22,23	97:2,22 98:4,7	<b>Marcus</b> 16:14	<b>meet</b> 31:19,20,25
<b>known</b> 10:23	<b>length</b> 105:20,23	6:23 10:17	49:5	98:10,14,20,24	<b>margin</b> 89:3	85:17
13:6 15:14	<b>letter</b> 17:25	59:25 94:24	<b>long</b> 28:2,15 70:9	99:1,5,14,19	<b>Marina's</b> 97:11	<b>meeting</b> 32:3
20:23 25:10	18:12 21:10	<b>liability</b> 21:8	72:15 76:13	108:11 109:1	<b>Mark</b> 4:15 11:22	36:14 103:11
26:5,6 27:18	102:24 103:2	23:14,15	104:12 106:22	109:25 110:18	12:11 35:14	103:14
30:25 54:5	<b>letters</b> 82:3	<b>liar</b> 38:22	111:18 113:1,5	114:17,19	36:15	<b>Mellor</b> 47:22
68:7 84:9	<b>let's</b> 11:19 56:11	<b>libel</b> 37:16 38:5	<b>long-standing</b>	<b>Lordship</b> 51:18	<b>marked</b> 10:11	<b>member</b> 24:12
<b>knows</b> 32:18	98:8	47:12 49:6	97:13	<b>Lorraine</b> 101:9	<b>market</b> 83:9,14	53:25 95:22
40:25 44:20	<b>Leveson</b> 1:4,16	50:15 51:25	<b>long-term</b> 95:18	<b>lose</b> 51:7,8,13	91:25	<b>members</b> 11:7
	1:20,25 2:11	53:24,25 54:1	<b>look</b> 3:18 5:7	71:12,14 91:10	<b>marriage</b> 67:25	103:12
<b>L</b>	3:16,22,25 4:6	69:8 79:7 83:3	20:19 25:16	<b>loss</b> 89:12	<b>married</b> 63:24	<b>mental</b> 48:24
<b>labelled</b> 82:15	4:14,19,21,25	83:5 92:3,4,9	27:13 35:24	<b>lost</b> 89:18 90:12	68:2 73:23	<b>mention</b> 20:7,9
<b>lack</b> 58:23	5:22 6:5,19	<b>lid</b> 64:10	42:11 43:1	<b>lot</b> 16:15 34:18	<b>Mason</b> 64:2	29:19 55:16
<b>lady</b> 17:11	7:13,16,20,25	<b>life</b> 43:22,23	49:3 57:19	48:24 54:20	<b>Master</b> 25:14,14	60:21
<b>land</b> 73:5	8:19 9:8,10,13	53:14 65:23	67:6 68:23	69:25 84:11	<b>material</b> 9:25	<b>mentioned</b> 43:13
<b>landed</b> 28:12	9:15,18 10:2,4	74:6,11 75:25	79:5 108:10	92:8 107:21,24	88:5 96:12	55:19 96:16
<b>language</b> 2:19	10:10,14,23	76:23 102:8	110:20 112:25	109:18 111:7	106:15	108:20
<b>large</b> 77:19,20	11:2,6,14,19	111:3	<b>looked</b> 106:14	111:13,23	<b>matter</b> 2:7 5:21	<b>merely</b> 5:24

105:21	66:4 67:24	108:22 111:12	45:25 46:1	68:12 70:8,25	107:2 109:23	103:8
<b>merits</b> 54:17	68:2 74:15	<b>necessary</b> 61:22	49:11 52:17	71:2,19 73:23	<b>ought</b> 6:6 11:11	<b>particular</b> 11:8
<b>message</b> 19:21	77:21 82:22	<b>need</b> 2:4 7:7,9	58:20 83:3	75:9,25 76:17	11:14 45:9	12:3 25:20
19:25 20:2	83:17,17,23	10:7 11:2 26:1	100:24 109:22	80:9 82:12	49:23 51:23	29:18 47:3
105:25	<b>money-grabbing</b>	31:10 36:22	111:19	<b>occasions</b> 27:12	93:7	58:2 60:12
<b>messages</b> 82:5	82:16	37:6 50:7	<b>newspapers</b>	41:22 76:14	<b>ounce</b> 82:7	71:8 113:15
105:22 112:22	<b>months</b> 73:19	51:17,23 53:11	40:15 43:21	<b>occurred</b> 25:2	<b>outcome</b> 34:13	<b>particularly</b>
<b>met</b> 63:23 84:23	<b>more-than-usual</b>	54:2 63:17	44:23 45:4,8	<b>occurring</b> 71:18	<b>outset</b> 44:10	67:20 71:16,19
84:23,24	112:14	67:9 79:2,5	48:2 50:16	<b>odd</b> 27:14	<b>outside</b> 11:16,16	75:21 78:2
<b>metaphoric</b>	<b>morning</b> 2:14	91:23 94:14,17	52:14 54:14,20	<b>oddity</b> 49:9	25:2,23 71:9	<b>parties</b> 24:17
48:11	3:14,17 56:20	108:6,7,8,9,10	55:24 66:25	<b>offence</b> 19:10	71:25 72:19,22	<b>Partington</b> 16:14
<b>Metropolitan</b>	63:4 74:22	<b>needed</b> 38:14	75:21 80:19	<b>offending</b> 97:11	72:24 102:10	<b>partner</b> 13:1,22
24:17 25:3,9	96:16 97:1,20	75:12 83:15	81:8 95:7,16	<b>offer</b> 22:15 23:4	<b>overspeaking</b>	21:15 35:14
25:13 65:2	97:25	103:4	95:17	23:6 27:17,21	60:3	36:14
98:6 100:8	<b>mother</b> 66:12	<b>needs</b> 15:12	<b>newsroom</b>	28:5,16,19	<b>o'clock</b> 39:16	<b>partners</b> 36:10
103:2 106:3	88:9	108:2	109:16,17	59:2 77:19	94:18 114:20	36:17
107:5 108:18	<b>motorcars</b>	<b>negotiate</b> 27:16	<b>nice</b> 85:20	<b>offered</b> 16:4 29:6		<b>partnership</b> 35:6
<b>middle</b> 17:9 45:1	111:20	<b>negotiated</b> 42:11	<b>night</b> 42:25	42:14 80:14	<b>P</b>	36:3,5
81:11	<b>move</b> 17:9 28:3,4	<b>negotiating</b>	<b>nine</b> 104:20	101:12	<b>page</b> 2:14 3:20	<b>parts</b> 40:22
<b>mid-2006</b> 104:13	34:15 37:2	28:23,25 29:12	<b>Nods</b> 28:18 64:4	<b>offering</b> 28:25	37:2 66:2,18	45:25
<b>mightn't</b> 17:2	39:5 41:18	29:21 30:8,10	<b>nonparty</b> 24:24	<b>offers</b> 28:24	71:4 80:21,22	<b>party</b> 45:9 74:20
<b>mile</b> 41:10	49:24 50:2	30:13,17,23	25:12	<b>office</b> 22:19	80:22 97:5	74:23
<b>miles</b> 41:10	58:16 65:4	42:10	<b>normal</b> 109:20	106:20 107:14	<b>pages</b> 108:24	<b>pass</b> 20:25 57:17
<b>million</b> 42:13	98:25	<b>negotiation</b>	<b>Normally</b> 31:11	110:12	<b>paid</b> 74:15	<b>passed</b> 89:20
<b>millions</b> 68:4	<b>moved</b> 84:6 90:9	22:16	<b>note</b> 57:12	<b>officers</b> 106:8	<b>paper</b> 3:1 38:14	<b>passengers</b> 34:12
<b>mind</b> 26:25 27:2	<b>movement</b> 71:6	<b>negotiations</b>	<b>notebooks</b>	<b>offices</b> 32:25	92:19	<b>path</b> 89:17
67:16 70:20	<b>moving</b> 37:24	27:10,11 30:22	103:15	<b>oh</b> 35:17 54:14	<b>paragon</b> 49:1	<b>Patry</b> 2:17 62:12
<b>mindful</b> 1:13 6:5	43:4 114:17	<b>neighbour</b> 71:1	<b>noted</b> 98:21	63:10 68:23	<b>paragraph</b> 12:19	63:3,4 67:11
<b>mine</b> 2:2 8:15	<b>MP</b> 34:22 103:5	<b>neither</b> 9:12	<b>notice</b> 72:13	69:1 82:22	14:21,22 29:19	67:14 75:1
<b>minister</b> 44:22	<b>MPs</b> 46:17	<b>never</b> 14:18	100:14	88:15	36:1,12 39:7	93:16,23 94:6
47:23	<b>Mulcaire</b> 20:10	21:24,24 33:9	<b>Notwithstanding</b>	<b>okay</b> 70:10 72:12	41:20 43:5	94:9,12
<b>minor</b> 46:19	21:5 23:24	34:8,9,12 35:8	14:14	87:11 91:19	57:5 58:18	<b>pattern</b> 104:18
<b>minute</b> 80:10	24:4 26:16,18	43:17 48:8	<b>November</b> 1:1	92:23 93:9	59:24 60:1,2	<b>Paul</b> 39:19 57:7
<b>minutes</b> 22:20	40:5 55:21	53:21 66:25	12:17 100:3	107:9	63:19,22 65:8	58:5 63:21,23
43:2 55:15	95:4 103:15	86:18 88:11	<b>Ntuli</b> 47:15	<b>old</b> 69:4 96:18	66:1,17 69:11	64:7,11 65:9
56:19 85:24	108:24 109:11	91:10 98:24	<b>number</b> 5:5	<b>old-fashioned</b>	70:14,18 71:4	65:17,19 66:15
<b>Mirror</b> 81:19	<b>Mulcaire's</b> 19:9	<b>Neville</b> 26:5,6	43:17 70:15	58:15	73:12 78:3	66:16 68:25
83:6,19	<b>multi-track</b>	27:7 38:13	73:22 77:25	<b>Olswangs</b> 42:9	79:15,22 82:24	69:10 70:22
<b>misconception</b>	49:10	<b>new</b> 60:23 76:24	88:10,11	<b>once</b> 57:19 89:18	113:21 114:16	71:5 73:12,21
40:18	<b>mum</b> 75:13	<b>news</b> 2:16 6:1	100:10 107:2,3	<b>ones</b> 69:7 74:16	<b>paragraphs</b>	73:23 74:21
<b>misconduct</b>	<b>murdering</b> 46:9	9:5,23 10:21	107:8,9,10,12	79:18 103:24	58:17 97:11	76:2,16 84:6
70:12	<b>Murdoch</b> 29:21	10:25 17:24,25	107:12,17	104:3 105:6,8	<b>parameters</b>	85:12 88:9
<b>mislead</b> 39:1	29:22,24 30:8	18:8 19:8,12	109:23,24	<b>one-off</b> 98:18	102:11	90:9,13
<b>ML2</b> 10:10	30:10,13,17,18	21:1,1,5,8,15	110:12	<b>ongoing</b> 26:1	<b>paraphrase</b> 14:9	<b>Paul's</b> 66:5 67:3
<b>Mm</b> 65:21 90:5	30:18,23,24	21:16 23:10,12	<b>numbers</b> 16:17	77:4	34:17	74:10 77:6
91:22 93:1	31:2,2	23:25 24:3	<b>nurse</b> 15:16	<b>online</b> 97:9,12	<b>paraphrasing</b>	84:10,15
114:15	<b>N</b>	26:12 27:8,8,8	<b>nursery</b> 15:16	<b>onus</b> 81:20	18:22	<b>pause</b> 3:22 60:4
<b>Mm-hm</b> 71:11	<b>name</b> 12:10,11	29:2 31:6,6	<b>nutshell</b> 38:6	<b>onwards</b> 70:14	<b>parcel</b> 114:10	61:7 94:12
76:12 88:20	26:16 56:14	32:11,11,22,22	85:14 111:6	78:3	<b>parent</b> 83:20	<b>pavement</b> 72:7
91:3	63:5 95:3	32:23 33:25	<b>O</b>	<b>open</b> 32:24 80:5	<b>parents</b> 75:20,22	<b>pay</b> 28:7 89:4
<b>mobile</b> 26:19	96:10,16 99:10	39:6,9,12 40:2	<b>obey</b> 46:8	80:7,15	<b>Parliament</b>	<b>paying</b> 31:5,6
55:23 107:12	<b>named</b> 33:9	40:3 41:19	<b>object</b> 111:2	<b>Operation</b>	46:17	<b>PBX</b> 107:14,14
107:14 109:24	34:20	42:9,14,20	<b>objection</b> 11:13	103:12 106:8	<b>Parliamentary</b>	108:6
110:11,14	<b>naming</b> 26:21	43:4 45:19,21	<b>observations</b>	<b>opinion</b> 14:12	39:2	<b>PCC</b> 37:6,13,18
<b>model</b> 52:21	<b>narrative</b> 100:12	45:22 74:14	9:10	37:4 69:24	<b>part</b> 16:23 18:21	37:25 38:2,3
<b>modern</b> 38:15	<b>narrow</b> 108:22	84:17 95:8,19	<b>obtain</b> 79:24	<b>opportunity</b>	19:5 20:8 23:3	45:8 69:12,17
<b>modicum</b> 19:17	<b>national</b> 50:17	95:23 100:10	89:20	57:19 86:6	23:4,6 27:18	69:19,25 79:10
<b>moment</b> 2:19 8:3	52:14	103:18,19	<b>obtained</b> 14:24	<b>option</b> 52:16	27:20,22 28:5	79:10,13
10:7 11:4	<b>naturally</b> 19:24	105:1,10,10	15:19,20 18:10	<b>order</b> 4:15 19:4	28:16,19 43:20	<b>PCC's</b> 38:7
19:14,15 20:12	110:5	107:23 109:16	20:23	51:6,9 83:9	47:24 57:23	<b>penny</b> 31:13,14
29:17 50:2	<b>nature</b> 40:17	109:17 113:24	<b>obvious</b> 43:12	<b>ordinary</b> 110:3	77:15 84:18	<b>people</b> 13:9,11
56:7 57:17	111:10	114:5	92:20	<b>organisation</b>	114:10	15:15 16:1,4,5
61:20 65:16	<b>Nazi</b> 44:22	<b>Newsnight</b> 34:24	<b>obviously</b> 7:4	101:25 106:21	<b>parte</b> 15:19	16:13 21:22
66:7 84:20	<b>near</b> 35:23 69:2	<b>newspaper</b> 21:5	15:8 16:24	109:14	<b>participant</b> 1:13	24:25 27:18
108:12	<b>necessarily</b> 1:16	27:3 39:14	30:24 47:1,3	<b>organised</b> 74:10	<b>participants</b> 1:8	30:19 34:19,20
<b>money</b> 29:1	8:22 41:8	40:1,4 43:10	51:11 65:14,22	<b>original</b> 8:7	98:16	40:18 41:5,13
35:23 42:15		43:11 44:5		<b>originating</b>	<b>participate</b>	43:19 45:18

46:3,9,10 48:9 50:6,7 51:12 51:22 52:1 53:2,12,25 54:3,6 61:16 66:24 69:25 75:3,20 76:7 76:17 80:8,10 81:8 82:6,22 84:8 85:17 86:16 87:11 90:22 92:2,7,8 111:14,15,16 111:22,24 112:6,9	113:9,23 114:4 <b>phoned</b> 32:24 103:4 <b>phones</b> 13:9,12 13:13 <b>phoning</b> 105:21 <b>photograph</b> 17:21 18:6 <b>photographed</b> 17:15 <b>photographer</b> 17:22 73:14 <b>photographers</b> 71:6,8,13 73:2 91:2,10 <b>photographs</b> 17:23 <b>physical</b> 48:24 <b>pick</b> 20:9 36:13 87:21 <b>picked</b> 16:3 37:22 39:16 <b>picking</b> 109:8 <b>pics</b> 71:2 <b>picture</b> 19:8 71:25 <b>pictures</b> 70:21 73:7,25 75:4 <b>piece</b> 3:13 38:13 98:23 105:1,18 107:1 112:4 <b>pieces</b> 110:17 112:6 113:5 <b>Pike</b> 21:14 24:9 29:5,20 30:7 30:20 31:17,24 32:15,23 33:1 <b>place</b> 29:25 30:5 48:17 53:21 80:2 86:16 97:18 98:2 109:17 <b>plainly</b> 114:13 <b>plan</b> 9:11 32:24 <b>planning</b> 22:18 <b>Platell</b> 41:21 42:21 43:24 44:4 55:3 59:1 <b>Platell's</b> 96:15 <b>play</b> 7:2 75:9 <b>pleaded</b> 19:9,13 <b>pleasantries</b> 22:20 <b>please</b> 2:11 11:21 11:25 12:9 14:18 60:17 63:4 72:8 75:10 80:4 89:10 94:5 99:8,11,23 100:1 102:13 102:22 103:13 <b>pleased</b> 36:15 97:22 <b>pleases</b> 14:19 <b>plus</b> 29:16 <b>pm</b> 114:22	<b>pocket</b> 92:22 <b>point</b> 16:21 17:10 24:1 28:11 55:12 56:4 58:16 88:19 89:5,23 91:19,21 92:12 92:24 96:14 104:24 106:6 109:25 110:1 114:12 <b>points</b> 92:12 96:22 110:5 113:22 <b>police</b> 5:9 11:1 24:18 25:3,9 25:13,15 37:5 65:3 71:20,22 71:25 72:1,8 73:3 95:24 98:6 100:8 103:2 106:3 107:5 108:18 110:20 <b>policy</b> 101:20 <b>political</b> 44:25 50:2 <b>popular</b> 48:2 <b>portrayed</b> 44:18 45:3 75:25 76:2 <b>position</b> 20:6 27:14 32:22 39:8 51:16 66:20 69:19 75:15 96:1 <b>possible</b> 17:7 111:16 <b>possibly</b> 20:3 49:5 96:25 103:6 <b>potentially</b> 53:23 <b>practice</b> 37:22 39:13 40:4 97:13 <b>practices</b> 5:12 98:15,16 108:13 <b>pre</b> 70:7 <b>preceded</b> 43:25 <b>precise</b> 23:10 90:24 <b>preconceived</b> 85:23 <b>prefer</b> 12:4 60:11 <b>pregnant</b> 72:4 <b>prejudice</b> 22:3 23:16 <b>prepared</b> 1:20 5:1 8:8 15:12 51:4 <b>preparing</b> 63:1 <b>presence</b> 96:21 <b>present</b> 25:17 51:1 61:18 108:17	<b>presented</b> 101:9 <b>presently</b> 8:1 52:9 <b>preservation</b> 45:16,17 <b>press</b> 2:12 5:3,12 41:19 44:14 45:13,14,16 46:4,5,10,11 46:14 48:16 51:19,20 53:2 53:19 65:6,18 66:3 69:12 70:12,19,21 71:5 95:13 <b>presumably</b> 76:14 <b>presume</b> 1:12 <b>prevent</b> 17:21 <b>previous</b> 64:2 78:5 <b>previously</b> 58:13 79:11 <b>pre-1996</b> 70:7 <b>pried</b> 48:13 <b>Princess</b> 72:13 <b>principally</b> 101:15 <b>principle</b> 1:18,21 1:23 54:21 <b>print</b> 76:19 91:17 92:9,10 97:10 <b>printed</b> 51:21,22 80:10,11 81:12 81:22 88:15 <b>printing</b> 86:22 <b>privacy</b> 13:4 20:22 22:2 23:2 47:5 49:6 49:15 51:4,7 51:15 53:4,5 70:19 89:6,12 89:18,20,22 90:12 91:1,21 <b>private</b> 10:12 18:2 39:13 43:22,23 65:23 70:22 74:4,6 76:23 107:15 111:3 <b>privileged</b> 10:13 <b>probabilities</b> 23:23 <b>probably</b> 2:4 14:1 20:17 22:20 59:15 62:16 78:13 91:15 99:21 <b>problem</b> 38:7 53:10 83:19 108:19 <b>problems</b> 66:5 <b>procedure</b> 27:18 <b>proceed</b> 2:1 6:6 10:8 11:15 61:11	<b>proceedings</b> 21:3 21:7,11,12 26:17 37:16,24 38:5 39:3 83:3 104:24 <b>process</b> 52:3 103:8 112:11 112:18 <b>Productions</b> 101:6 <b>productive</b> 112:19 <b>productivity</b> 105:12 <b>professional</b> 12:12 13:25 <b>profile</b> 89:13 <b>profit</b> 89:3 <b>programme</b> 77:11,16 90:20 <b>prohibit</b> 17:4 <b>prolific</b> 105:1 <b>prominence</b> 80:24,25 81:6 <b>prominent</b> 102:2 111:13 <b>propaganda</b> 44:22 <b>proper</b> 18:10,17 18:25 19:3,6 32:12 48:6 57:1 <b>properly</b> 18:20 20:8 22:1 110:4 <b>property</b> 101:2,3 111:11 <b>proposed</b> 9:11 <b>proposition</b> 88:21 <b>prosecution</b> 24:19 34:21 <b>prospect</b> 83:22 91:24 <b>protect</b> 51:7 <b>protocol</b> 1:6 <b>prove</b> 81:20,21 81:22 86:20,20 86:21 87:1 <b>provide</b> 3:4 74:20,24 100:1 <b>provided</b> 10:25 12:16 18:7 27:7 41:14 57:16 63:7 <b>provision</b> 36:8 <b>provisions</b> 36:5 <b>pry</b> 41:6 <b>public</b> 8:21 38:1 38:3 42:19 43:18 48:7,8 55:22 56:15 62:21 63:20 65:11 73:5 74:11 76:23 79:12 82:15 89:25 90:1	96:8,13 <b>publication</b> 17:4 17:21 59:1 <b>publicity</b> 11:16 <b>publicly</b> 8:12 <b>publish</b> 18:1,1,3 18:4,9 50:23 88:24 97:14,18 <b>published</b> 16:2 18:6,14 23:3 57:18 64:8 68:18 75:2 77:25 78:1,23 80:2,18 81:8 96:11 <b>publishing</b> 76:22 88:5 97:7 <b>purchases</b> 113:17 <b>purdah</b> 62:8 <b>purely</b> 85:1 <b>purpose</b> 90:24 <b>purposes</b> 62:22 <b>pursue</b> 49:12,16 53:24 54:15 58:12 101:5 <b>pursued</b> 22:25 54:9 83:5 <b>pursuing</b> 53:16 83:2 <b>pushed</b> 80:12 <b>put</b> 5:19 9:5 22:10 26:13 42:3,17,20 45:23 57:1 63:18 67:9,14 74:13 77:7 83:8,14 87:24 90:23 99:15 101:10 <b>puts</b> 55:5 92:7 <b>putting</b> 74:5 76:23 91:24	19:19 25:21 87:16 99:15,17 102:20 107:13 109:7,11,12,18 110:4,10 111:7 111:9,23 112:13,18 <b>quo</b> 45:16 <b>quotations</b> 30:14 <b>quote</b> 30:10,14 41:3
<b>R</b>						
<b>R</b> 110:6 <b>raise</b> 2:10 18:22 51:12 58:17 <b>raised</b> 94:14 97:1 <b>raises</b> 5:5 59:22 <b>ramifications</b> 35:25 <b>ran</b> 49:11 101:2 <b>ranging</b> 68:4 <b>rarely</b> 14:19 68:19,19 <b>raspberry</b> 3:3 <b>rate</b> 105:12 108:17 <b>reacted</b> 90:10 <b>reaction</b> 22:13 35:17 37:13 39:5 70:23 <b>read</b> 3:5 9:24 36:23,24 45:19 59:4 75:21 <b>readers</b> 40:3 45:22 97:16 <b>readily</b> 56:8 <b>Reading</b> 89:9 <b>ready</b> 1:8 <b>real</b> 80:1 <b>realise</b> 15:24 81:16 <b>realised</b> 78:9 <b>reality</b> 66:15 68:5 <b>really</b> 22:15 46:5 47:25 50:1 52:7 64:11 69:21 70:1 80:10,12 85:20 89:22 90:14,15 91:11 108:16 <b>reason</b> 10:16 36:8 42:17 44:5 48:10,14 48:18 49:16 84:10 102:25 109:12 110:2 <b>reasonable</b> 31:13 <b>reasonably</b> 105:24 <b>reasons</b> 6:15 7:5 12:4 44:10 84:8 90:11 112:7 113:12 <b>Rebekah</b> 43:7,10 44:2,7 58:19						
<b>Q</b>						
<b>Queen's</b> 49:8 <b>question</b> 6:12 18:21,24 31:5 37:24 39:5 41:15 48:21 57:20 67:12 68:21,23 86:14 90:25 <b>questioned</b> 73:17 <b>questions</b> 6:21 12:8 46:23,25 55:4,17 56:24 57:2 59:8,11 59:16,25 63:3 63:12,16 73:22 86:5,23 99:20 108:2,5 112:3 <b>quick</b> 61:5,6 85:21 <b>quickly</b> 29:3 <b>quiet</b> 24:20 <b>quite</b> 5:6 10:20						

59:1 84:1,16 84:23 96:17 <b>recall</b> 113:2 <b>received</b> 1:7 9:20 26:4,14 28:15 36:19 39:10 <b>recognise</b> 7:15 53:10,16 <b>recognised</b> 89:11 89:12 <b>recollection</b> 25:3 <b>recording</b> 26:15 <b>records</b> 16:14 38:25 108:10 <b>recover</b> 27:22 51:5,6 <b>recruit</b> 95:6 <b>recruited</b> 95:17 <b>recruitment</b> 95:15 <b>redacted</b> 6:13 60:12 103:14 103:20 104:6 104:10 105:5 107:1,2 <b>redacting</b> 16:16 <b>redaction</b> 10:18 <b>redactions</b> 59:22 <b>refer</b> 70:11 <b>reference</b> 105:19 <b>referred</b> 9:22 95:12 103:18 <b>referring</b> 60:1 <b>reform</b> 53:24,25 <b>Refuge</b> 64:18,23 <b>refused</b> 24:14 <b>refuted</b> 96:19 <b>regain</b> 90:11 <b>regard</b> 7:21 113:25 <b>regarded</b> 51:25 <b>regards</b> 1:25 <b>regularity</b> 104:20 <b>regulation</b> 33:4 33:22 44:14,19 44:21 45:3,5 45:12,17,18,20 51:19,20 114:19 <b>regulator</b> 45:15 <b>reject</b> 28:24 <b>rejected</b> 34:14 <b>rejection</b> 18:16 <b>relate</b> 55:17 <b>related</b> 39:24 40:1 58:7 103:16 <b>relates</b> 70:3,6 <b>relating</b> 111:3,17 <b>relation</b> 1:5 39:21 42:6 55:22 63:22 69:14 79:19,23 80:16 87:24 92:13 96:6,6 106:13 109:5	109:10 111:1 113:17 <b>relationship</b> 16:9 41:1 47:16 63:23,24 64:2 64:7 65:7,9 66:12,15 71:5 73:12 76:15 84:1,3 90:6,8 90:12 96:17 <b>release</b> 56:16 <b>released</b> 100:8 <b>relevance</b> 25:18 <b>relevant</b> 24:9 37:17 70:12 74:20,23 80:19 111:25 <b>relief</b> 78:21 <b>reluctant</b> 94:3 112:9 <b>rely</b> 93:25 <b>remedies</b> 91:24 <b>remedy</b> 80:1 88:25 89:1 91:21 <b>remember</b> 19:5 29:25 32:19,24 35:21 39:18 69:14,19 70:2 70:2,5 104:23 <b>reminding</b> 73:20 <b>remit</b> 108:17 <b>remote</b> 41:4 <b>remotest</b> 53:22 <b>remove</b> 97:11 <b>removed</b> 61:9 <b>repeated</b> 98:18 <b>repeatedly</b> 43:6 <b>repercussions</b> 86:12,12 <b>reply</b> 77:5 <b>report</b> 2:13 4:4 71:20 <b>reported</b> 20:19 38:24 73:24 90:17,17 <b>reporter</b> 2:17 100:23 <b>reporters</b> 112:2 <b>reporting</b> 95:4 <b>reports</b> 68:3 <b>represent</b> 52:16 52:18 <b>representative</b> 66:8 <b>represented</b> 17:11 54:2 <b>representing</b> 13:9,11 <b>reputation</b> 49:9 50:14 <b>reputational</b> 55:2 <b>request</b> 24:14 <b>requested</b> 18:14 <b>require</b> 6:14 8:10	<b>requires</b> 1:9 8:19 54:12 <b>resign</b> 43:7 <b>resignation</b> 43:9 <b>resist</b> 98:6 <b>resolution</b> 52:8 54:10 <b>resolve</b> 60:19 62:4 <b>resolved</b> 87:20 <b>resolving</b> 87:15 <b>respect</b> 3:11 14:13 64:16 78:22 81:4 <b>respectfully</b> 55:4 <b>respects</b> 49:20 <b>respond</b> 60:21 66:19 <b>responded</b> 36:18 <b>responding</b> 112:23 <b>response</b> 78:13 98:5 <b>responsible</b> 95:23 <b>rest</b> 79:8 91:2 <b>result</b> 20:14 21:7 26:3 34:17 42:23 44:15 57:1 59:8 92:15 <b>resume</b> 27:6 <b>retain</b> 89:20 <b>retainer</b> 20:18 <b>rethink</b> 61:15 <b>retired</b> 63:21 <b>retrospect</b> 113:8 <b>return</b> 30:3 94:10 <b>reverse</b> 54:5 <b>review</b> 8:8 98:15 <b>reviews</b> 52:23 <b>revisit</b> 1:21 61:22 <b>Rhodri</b> 6:9 8:1 9:15 61:13,17 94:16 <b>rich</b> 51:25 52:1 <b>rid</b> 54:12 85:22 <b>ride</b> 75:14 <b>right</b> 3:16,23 4:6 4:11 5:22 7:13 7:16,25 9:8,15 10:10 11:14,19 12:7 13:21 18:3 20:14 22:11 29:7 31:7,15 32:10 33:21,23 36:2 37:25 47:13,15 48:9 49:19 57:3 61:1,17 61:21 64:13 65:24 66:2 67:4 72:23 74:2 75:13 77:2,5 79:19	85:10 89:7 94:12,25 95:20 96:14,24 99:17 102:15 106:1,5 108:12 109:1 113:2 <b>rightly</b> 77:20 109:7 <b>rights</b> 73:24 <b>ring</b> 110:5 <b>ringing</b> 39:17 <b>rise</b> 47:20 <b>risk</b> 23:8 56:6 61:23 <b>risks</b> 56:13 72:9 72:10 <b>risky</b> 53:22 <b>road</b> 53:12 <b>Robert</b> 110:6,6 <b>Roddy</b> 79:7 <b>rolling</b> 97:8 <b>Rome</b> 84:25 <b>room</b> 11:16 32:25 <b>rooms</b> 32:25 <b>roughly</b> 70:5 <b>round</b> 71:13 <b>roundabouts</b> 71:13 <b>route</b> 108:15 <b>routine</b> 3:1 113:23 <b>Rowland</b> 4:17 99:4,6,8,12,14 99:21 100:4 108:12 110:24 <b>royal</b> 19:11 24:1 <b>Rule</b> 55:6 <b>rules</b> 46:8 <b>ruling</b> 1:5,15,17 6:20 11:3,6 72:17 <b>run</b> 1:14 8:20 56:12 102:9 111:12 112:2 <b>running</b> 2:15 43:21 64:21 <b>Rupert</b> 29:24 31:2 <b>Rusbridger</b> 114:2 <b>rush</b> 99:3 112:3	105:16 107:2 <b>saying</b> 17:25 19:21,25 22:16 25:16 30:13,22 34:24 38:22,23 39:1 44:17 57:25 69:3 74:9 85:19 86:15 87:12 97:24 <b>says</b> 2:14 7:18 44:22 51:2 52:14 60:1 68:23 102:7 <b>scandal</b> 15:3 46:17 <b>scared</b> 82:12 83:22 86:11,11 86:12 <b>schemes</b> 54:11 <b>school</b> 75:16,19 75:24 <b>scope</b> 4:23 <b>score</b> 96:18 <b>screen</b> 61:9 63:10 <b>scrutinised</b> 65:11 <b>searching</b> 74:22 <b>second</b> 3:20 8:3 8:9 12:3 15:4 16:23 38:4 43:23 58:16 89:5 <b>secondary</b> 45:11 <b>secondly</b> 4:16 5:9 21:6 61:11 112:11 <b>seconds</b> 105:23 <b>section</b> 101:3 <b>sector</b> 46:10 100:24 <b>security</b> 22:23 108:8 <b>see</b> 4:4 8:23 9:13 16:21 17:9 18:6 19:8 20:25 21:16,24 22:5 35:13 39:5 41:18 44:14 47:19 49:15 51:18 52:12,25 55:10 57:23 60:15,18 63:10 80:9,10 94:5 97:16 105:21 107:4 109:1 112:3 <b>seeing</b> 96:7,12 <b>seeking</b> 24:24 114:11 <b>seemingly</b> 15:17 <b>seen</b> 3:17 4:25 6:9,11 8:13 9:18 11:11 68:24 85:7 99:21 111:9	<b>sees</b> 56:15 <b>Select</b> 13:14 37:3 <b>self-regulation</b> 44:20 45:6,7 <b>self-reproach</b> 2:15 <b>sell</b> 15:22 16:1 <b>selling</b> 74:4 <b>send</b> 2:22 112:6 <b>sense</b> 19:18 22:22 79:4 109:11 112:24 <b>sent</b> 2:17 17:25 18:12 107:5 <b>sentence</b> 12:19 15:6 <b>separate</b> 5:21 <b>Sergeant</b> 38:18 <b>series</b> 102:1 104:12 111:18 113:1,5 <b>serious</b> 5:10 7:7 39:1 87:25 <b>seriously</b> 3:10 <b>served</b> 23:12,15 24:11 <b>Service</b> 24:19 50:17 100:8 106:3 <b>set</b> 22:16 37:7,17 84:18,21 102:1 111:11 <b>settle</b> 22:8 96:18 <b>settled</b> 30:2 33:18 83:7,11 104:25 <b>settlement</b> 29:13 31:6 42:6,11 <b>seven</b> 101:4 <b>shadowy</b> 111:8 <b>sharp</b> 108:2 <b>sheer</b> 68:16 <b>Sheffield</b> 47:11 <b>Sherborne</b> 5:23 6:4,18 7:3,15 7:17,24 8:18 9:7,9,12,14 10:11,22,24 11:5,12,18 <b>Sheryl</b> 4:16 62:12,15 63:6 <b>she'd</b> 19:20 <b>shopping</b> 73:15 <b>short</b> 56:22,25 57:2,16 59:9 60:18 99:3 <b>shortly</b> 83:8 <b>show</b> 27:16 73:8 74:16 <b>shown</b> 104:5 <b>shows</b> 51:9 101:8 101:10 <b>sick</b> 95:18 <b>side</b> 28:13 40:17 50:21 77:8,9 <b>sides</b> 54:13 <b>side's</b> 28:7	<b>signature</b> 100:2 <b>signed</b> 24:7,9,12 99:23 <b>significance</b> 5:11 26:8 <b>significant</b> 11:9 25:21 <b>significantly</b> 26:10 <b>silence</b> 78:6 <b>silent</b> 108:3,5 <b>similar</b> 55:12 80:25 <b>Simon</b> 34:22 95:5 <b>simple</b> 68:21 <b>simply</b> 40:1,5 41:4 50:5 55:19 95:9 <b>single</b> 31:14 66:12 83:20 107:7 <b>sinister</b> 110:17 <b>Sink</b> 101:22 <b>sir</b> 1:12 3:24 4:13 6:4,18 7:3 7:10,17 9:7 10:21 11:12,18 11:21 12:6 37:2,20 59:8 59:17 60:20 62:12 93:17 96:25 98:21 99:17 108:19 <b>sit</b> 11:25 72:19 <b>sitting</b> 91:15 <b>situation</b> 47:22 85:2 <b>situations</b> 47:21 <b>six</b> 91:7 <b>size</b> 98:21 <b>sketch</b> 97:11 100:18 <b>Sky</b> 34:22 <b>Skylet</b> 105:2,15 <b>slash</b> 112:1 <b>slight</b> 72:13,15 <b>slightly</b> 1:11 3:5 3:5 11:11 43:25 67:7 94:2,9 <b>slim</b> 98:22 <b>sling</b> 73:2 <b>slips</b> 110:8 <b>slur</b> 56:16 <b>small</b> 28:11 49:14,15 75:7 <b>smile</b> 29:8 <b>smoking</b> 23:19 27:13 <b>snobbish</b> 49:6 <b>Society</b> 38:10 <b>sold</b> 15:16 16:8 73:24 83:11 84:18 85:2 90:19 <b>solely</b> 88:15
---	---	--	---	--	---	--

<b>solicitor</b> 11:25 24:13 39:11 42:9 103:13 106:10	21:23 <b>spread</b> 80:21 <b>spreading</b> 60:22 <b>stage</b> 6:24 12:1 13:20 20:11 32:5 44:13 66:22 79:9 94:15	<b>step</b> 10:2 61:20 <b>steps</b> 98:1 <b>sticks</b> 70:20 <b>stood</b> 92:13 <b>stop</b> 20:6 31:4 45:6 52:17 54:6 102:4 111:14	<b>subsequently</b> 27:1,3 103:2 <b>substance</b> 106:15 <b>substantial</b> 103:25 <b>substantive</b> 105:25	<b>supposition</b> 40:9 109:9 <b>sure</b> 8:25 10:6 11:12 12:4 24:10,21 30:7 30:9,16 43:25 56:5 63:17 72:17 75:20 80:22 91:18 93:8 94:12 98:18 99:9	<b>taped</b> 82:5 <b>target</b> 66:14 <b>Taylforth's</b> 92:5 <b>Taylor</b> 12:13 13:2 17:16 19:9,21 20:13 20:15,20,25 22:8,25 24:2 24:16 27:25 34:4,4,9,21 35:20	106:22 <b>ten</b> 43:2 <b>Tench</b> 42:8 <b>tend</b> 11:17 <b>term</b> 106:16 107:15 <b>terms</b> 22:24 27:20 30:22 44:21 102:15 103:21 105:18 <b>terrible</b> 34:24 46:22
<b>solve</b> 25:21 <b>solving</b> 87:14 <b>somebody</b> 2:1 24:3 27:13 40:24 78:15 90:1 94:4 106:6 107:25 112:3	<b>stages</b> 33:6 <b>stake</b> 83:12 <b>Stalinist</b> 44:22 <b>stamps</b> 111:22 <b>stand</b> 54:1 72:23 <b>Standard</b> 56:2 95:5,10 101:17 <b>Standards</b> 95:22 <b>standing</b> 20:18 <b>stands</b> 107:14 <b>Star</b> 81:10 <b>stark</b> 44:18 <b>start</b> 1:4 28:10 44:17 85:19 91:5	<b>stopped</b> 73:16 76:15 88:9 102:6 <b>stopping</b> 112:16 <b>stories</b> 40:14 43:22 53:17 76:17,18 81:9 81:11 85:3 113:1	<b>successful</b> 22:25 79:23 83:6 102:5 105:4,6 105:7,13,14,19 <b>succinctly</b> 63:18 <b>such-and-such</b> 40:23,24 <b>sudden</b> 21:25 43:20 <b>suddenly</b> 15:25 43:18,19	<b>surname</b> 29:24 <b>surprise</b> 9:16 21:19,20 <b>surprising</b> 3:6 14:16 <b>surveillance</b> 44:8 <b>suspect</b> 113:22 <b>suspicion</b> 107:18 <b>suspicious</b> 105:17 <b>suspicious</b> 105:15 <b>swear</b> 35:17 <b>swifter</b> 91:23 <b>sworn</b> 62:15 <b>system</b> 49:24,25 51:1,9 54:2 106:20 107:14	<b>Taylor's</b> 19:10 26:10 27:6 31:6 34:25 <b>teaching</b> 26:18 95:11 <b>team</b> 5:16 6:22 11:8 93:24 <b>technical</b> 107:15 <b>technician</b> 67:8 <b>technique</b> 111:25 112:2 <b>technology</b> 100:21,24 101:20 107:13 113:3 <b>teetotal</b> 32:19 <b>telecommunic...</b> 100:22 113:6 <b>Telegraph</b> 100:25 101:3 <b>telephone</b> 16:14 16:16 29:9 33:1,16,17 39:10 88:10,11 102:25 104:12 106:20 108:6	<b>terrific</b> 103:25 <b>territory</b> 91:12 91:14 108:16 <b>thalidomide</b> 46:18 <b>thank</b> 2:9 3:16 3:22 4:6 5:22 9:13 11:19,21 12:1,7 17:9 19:25 31:15 46:23 54:23,24 55:9,11 59:7 62:6,14 63:2 65:6 93:9,10 93:11,14,15,16 95:25 96:4,23 97:21,22 98:4 98:20 99:13,14 106:11 107:11 110:2,22 114:20
<b>son</b> 63:25 77:20 88:10,13 <b>soon</b> 65:9 97:9 <b>sorry</b> 4:20 30:12 30:16 33:6,6 33:14,16 40:1 54:25 59:2 60:20 78:24 <b>sort</b> 22:22 23:22 34:6 40:17 46:19 50:23 76:24 83:23 85:24	<b>started</b> 22:21 24:23 27:11 29:10 34:18 60:16 64:19 65:9 86:8 95:18 100:21 101:25 104:13 <b>starting</b> 2:12 24:1 <b>state</b> 44:19,21 45:3,5,5 63:4 <b>statement</b> 5:1,5 5:15 6:10 8:7,9 9:19,21 12:2 12:12,17,19,22 12:25 14:8,21 15:23 17:14 21:14 22:7 24:7,12,15 25:1,19 29:20 30:15 34:16 36:2,23 37:8 37:15,17 38:1 38:3 39:8 41:20 43:6 44:8 57:5,7 58:4,6,18 59:25 60:2 61:9 63:1,7,12 63:19 65:8,18 66:17 68:14 69:10 70:11,14 78:2 79:15,25 80:5,7,12,14 82:25 83:24 99:22,24 100:4 100:11 113:21	<b>story</b> 14:24,25 15:16,22 16:1 16:2,7,8,20 18:2,3,4,9,14 19:4,15,16,16 19:18,19 20:20 20:24 23:3 34:15 35:2,19 35:25 40:19,20 42:24 43:19,20 47:16 48:5 71:25 82:6 84:18,21 92:21 97:6 <b>straight</b> 72:8 <b>Strand</b> 12:13 <b>Strasbourg</b> 50:9 <b>stream</b> 110:15 <b>Street</b> 31:21 <b>strength</b> 26:10 78:14 <b>stressful</b> 83:4 <b>strike</b> 23:16 <b>strikes</b> 6:6 16:6 87:22 <b>striking</b> 114:9 <b>strip</b> 48:3 <b>strong</b> 107:18,18 <b>Stronger</b> 64:9 76:21 83:24 <b>strongly</b> 97:4 113:21 <b>structures</b> 50:13 <b>struggled</b> 74:18 <b>struggling</b> 94:9 <b>stuff</b> 87:16 88:24 <b>subeditor</b> 101:1 <b>subeditors</b> 110:4 <b>subject</b> 6:3 7:21 10:18 12:21 18:21 25:24,25 47:12 58:11 65:19 <b>subjects</b> 112:12 <b>submission</b> 94:16,17,23 <b>submissions</b> 1:7 1:10,21 25:15 <b>subsequent</b> 58:21	<b>sue</b> 39:19 51:2,3 57:8 58:5 82:22 92:19 <b>sued</b> 47:10 <b>suffered</b> 85:13 <b>sufficiently</b> 2:6 <b>suggest</b> 6:2 7:25 40:22 58:5 <b>suggested</b> 15:2 21:16 22:5 32:17 39:19 47:19 108:15 <b>suggesting</b> 59:5 87:10,11 <b>suggestion</b> 3:8 58:19 <b>sum</b> 50:21 <b>summarise</b> 92:13 <b>summary</b> 14:11 <b>summer</b> 63:24 83:8 <b>Sun</b> 2:16,21,21 3:9,14 64:21 97:5,6 <b>sunbathing</b> 70:21 <b>Sunday</b> 15:15 16:1,4,5,13 35:15 45:18 81:19 83:19 84:18 101:16 101:16 111:7,8 <b>Sun's</b> 109:16 <b>supplement</b> 111:12 <b>supplemental</b> 9:20 <b>supplementary</b> 4:25 5:4 9:18 <b>support</b> 54:17 <b>supporter</b> 65:1 <b>supportive</b> 78:17 <b>suppose</b> 41:15 42:2 44:16 48:11 97:23 102:6 113:11 <b>supposed</b> 39:23	<b>tabloid</b> 20:2 112:8 <b>take</b> 1:13 2:3 10:17 13:20 19:5 28:13,17 28:20 31:23 33:6 35:18 38:15 45:24 51:17 52:16 57:4 66:25 67:4 70:15 71:21 73:7 75:4 77:15 78:4 79:1 82:10 92:2 97:20 99:7 105:22 110:21 <b>taken</b> 42:24 43:2 48:17 <b>takes</b> 48:24 <b>talk</b> 4:11 21:9 45:6 46:3,4 48:3 54:14 60:17 62:19 112:9 <b>talked</b> 47:6 50:10 75:1,2,3 103:23 <b>talking</b> 30:21 38:16 51:19 67:24 84:19 87:16 111:13 111:23 114:3 <b>talks</b> 65:3 <b>tampered</b> 107:19 108:1	<b>technical</b> 107:15 <b>technician</b> 67:8 <b>technique</b> 111:25 112:2 <b>technology</b> 100:21,24 101:20 107:13 113:3 <b>teetotal</b> 32:19 <b>telecommunic...</b> 100:22 113:6 <b>Telegraph</b> 100:25 101:3 <b>telephone</b> 16:14 16:16 29:9 33:1,16,17 39:10 88:10,11 102:25 104:12 106:20 108:6 <b>telephoned</b> 35:14 42:7,8 42:25 <b>television</b> 77:11 77:15 101:5 <b>tell</b> 12:9,12,25 14:8 17:14 18:7 21:14 22:7 23:9 24:15 25:1 26:14 27:17 29:21 30:1 31:16 32:4 34:16 37:3,4,9 37:21 38:6 41:12,20,22 42:23 43:6 59:19,20 64:15 68:14,16 69:10 69:15 75:18 77:18 78:2 79:21,22 80:4 83:4 85:14 88:1 93:24 100:17 102:22 103:6 107:9,10 109:13,15 <b>telling</b> 47:16 110:25 <b>tells</b> 106:20,22	<b>ten</b> 43:2 <b>Tench</b> 42:8 <b>tend</b> 11:17 <b>term</b> 106:16 107:15 <b>terms</b> 22:24 27:20 30:22 44:21 102:15 103:21 105:18 <b>terrible</b> 34:24 46:22 <b>terribly</b> 103:25 <b>territory</b> 91:12 91:14 108:16 <b>thalidomide</b> 46:18 <b>thank</b> 2:9 3:16 3:22 4:6 5:22 9:13 11:19,21 12:1,7 17:9 19:25 31:15 46:23 54:23,24 55:9,11 59:7 62:6,14 63:2 65:6 93:9,10 93:11,14,15,16 95:25 96:4,23 97:21,22 98:4 98:20 99:13,14 106:11 107:11 110:2,22 114:20 <b>theft</b> 113:7,9 <b>there</b> 42:18 <b>they'd</b> 110:12 <b>thing</b> 21:25 51:2 55:7,13,14 62:7 89:24 <b>things</b> 14:3 38:24 40:6 41:6 43:17 46:20 48:12,15 51:13 59:23 62:19 66:21,23 67:10 68:15 75:22,23 75:23 84:7 87:22 88:8 90:10,16 96:5 106:25 109:4 <b>think</b> 1:6 6:6 7:22 10:6 11:10,14 14:13 15:6 20:7,19 20:21 22:19 23:1 25:19 31:10 36:22 37:12 39:15,23 40:16 41:8 43:16,23 44:4 44:6 45:7,10 47:8 49:24,25 50:20 52:11 55:7 56:1,2,19 57:1 61:11 66:7,22 72:6 72:17 76:17

77:4,6 78:10	76:5,15,21	<b>triangular</b> 28:10	10:24 11:5,12	<b>v</b> 15:20	39:24 57:11	96:12 102:12
81:10,13,14,15	77:7,24 78:3	<b>Tribunal</b> 2:18	12:4,18 23:4	<b>values</b> 47:25	<b>wasn't</b> 16:2,9	<b>we've</b> 6:8 26:7
81:15 82:22	78:12 84:9,13	10:8 56:15	24:6 25:18	<b>van</b> 49:11	19:2,16 20:11	29:10 38:19
83:18,19 84:10	84:16,24 85:13	<b>tried</b> 61:24 92:12	40:16 41:11	<b>various</b> 24:15,17	23:2 24:2 26:6	60:16 61:24
84:15,17,23	85:17 89:20	<b>Trotskyite</b> 44:21	48:4 52:5,6,22	26:3 43:21	30:24 32:1,15	75:1,2,3 82:19
85:8 86:14	91:9 97:20	<b>troubling</b> 2:6	53:6,15,24	<b>vehicle</b> 72:20	33:14 39:4,25	98:17
87:1,17 88:22	102:9 103:19	<b>true</b> 12:22 18:5	54:23 56:4,18	<b>ventilate</b> 8:15	42:15,16,17	<b>whilst</b> 21:8 28:3
89:2,24 90:15	104:10 107:24	19:16 42:15,16	56:18 60:8	<b>ventilated</b> 5:3	48:4 85:2	28:9 65:6
91:13 92:8,17	<b>times</b> 35:21	43:1 63:13	62:21 74:13	<b>vernacular</b>	87:10 105:20	70:22 71:5
94:16 96:9,11	71:13 75:12	65:15 79:6	78:7 80:16	20:22	112:12,16	113:8
96:21 102:20	78:19 95:7,16	81:16,22 85:22	86:5 87:9,9	<b>version</b> 97:12	<b>waste</b> 69:25	<b>white</b> 44:19
103:9 106:18	95:17 100:23	86:21,22 87:3	88:18 89:5	99:23 100:9	<b>water</b> 99:9	87:16,17
107:20,21,25	101:16,16	<b>truth</b> 19:17,18	92:11,11,19,23	103:20 105:5	<b>Watergate</b> 46:18	<b>Whittingdale</b>
108:1,3,19	107:24 108:20	24:8,13 76:7,7	92:24 93:12,17	105:17 107:3	<b>way</b> 2:8 6:19	38:24
109:1,2 110:13	109:21 110:4	77:9 82:23	96:2,14 98:7,7	<b>versions</b> 103:15	11:9 25:22	<b>wider</b> 5:3 73:24
110:15 111:15	111:19 113:2	100:4	103:11 104:19	104:6,9,11	40:1,15 49:14	<b>widely</b> 11:11
111:25 113:12	<b>time-consuming</b>	<b>truthful</b> 38:20	109:5 110:10	<b>victim</b> 13:13	49:15 53:4,10	<b>widespread</b> 40:4
114:9	48:23 83:4	<b>try</b> 59:16 62:23	110:18	64:6 81:20	54:8 59:12	114:8
<b>thinking</b> 8:1	<b>timing</b> 42:19	71:12 75:10	<b>understanding</b>	86:20	66:22 73:15	<b>wildly</b> 112:13
71:24 87:4	<b>tiny</b> 80:23	85:20 98:17	59:6 90:15	<b>victims</b> 20:12	77:5 79:10	<b>willingness</b>
<b>third</b> 33:8 38:4	<b>title</b> 23:11 41:19	110:24	106:12 110:25	25:7,11 32:6	80:18 83:18,22	15:22 54:13
45:8 77:6	<b>today</b> 4:15,24	<b>trying</b> 4:9 75:4	<b>understands</b> 7:6	32:13 33:24	86:25 87:14,15	<b>Wilmshurst</b>
81:12 91:19,21	9:25 44:5,9	98:11 108:21	23:11 45:2	37:23 64:12	87:19 106:5	47:10 54:1
93:18 94:6	75:11 86:10	<b>Tunnel</b> 101:22	83:1	65:5	110:24 112:10	<b>win</b> 49:20 51:9
<b>thirdly</b> 4:16 5:10	91:15 96:21	<b>turn</b> 65:6 70:15	<b>understood</b>	<b>victory</b> 28:11	112:16	67:1 82:18
<b>Thomas</b> 99:6,12	<b>Today's</b> 4:13	76:9 79:17	82:12 98:3,21	<b>view</b> 12:5 76:13	<b>ways</b> 51:11	<b>window</b> 73:7
<b>thought</b> 4:7	<b>told</b> 15:8 16:24	<b>turning</b> 27:21	106:9,10 111:5	<b>views</b> 74:7 76:16	52:25	<b>windows</b> 75:4
10:19 14:9	18:11 22:17	<b>twice</b> 89:2	<b>undertaking</b>	81:3,5	<b>wearing</b> 48:4,5	<b>wine</b> 31:21
22:21,24 24:21	28:15 29:20	<b>two</b> 15:12 32:5,9	36:21	<b>Vino</b> 31:21	<b>website</b> 43:3	111:21
29:23 32:11	32:4 33:1	33:7,19 34:19	<b>unfair</b> 75:12	<b>violence</b> 64:6,12	59:24	<b>winning</b> 28:14
41:8 47:2	39:18 40:12	35:12 36:5	<b>unfortunately</b>	64:17,18	<b>websites</b> 102:1	<b>wish</b> 7:11 9:6
48:25 49:3	43:14 58:23	38:24 40:21	16:6 75:24	<b>virtually</b> 21:10	<b>wedding</b> 70:7	12:18 55:5
66:21 78:14	67:2 71:3,21	41:22 42:3	94:7	<b>virtue</b> 49:1	73:25 74:5	74:24
79:2	72:10 75:23	55:1 61:15	<b>unlawful</b> 20:24	<b>voicemail</b> 41:4,5	90:19	<b>witness</b> 5:1,18
<b>thread</b> 98:23	81:17 83:15	64:1 66:13	23:18	102:16,21	<b>Wednesday</b> 1:1	7:18 12:16,21
<b>threat</b> 44:1	97:3	75:9 81:11	<b>unpleasant</b> 3:5	103:1 104:14	47:11	13:14 14:8,21
<b>threaten</b> 17:18	<b>Tom</b> 4:17 18:7	87:13 96:22	<b>unredacted</b>	105:4,21 111:1	<b>weekly</b> 100:23	17:14 29:20
<b>three</b> 33:19	18:18 19:5	97:11 100:8	100:9 103:14	<b>voluntarily</b>	<b>weeks</b> 77:21	30:14 36:1
40:22 77:21	21:23 31:25	101:25 104:1	103:24 104:3,9	15:17	<b>Weeting</b> 103:12	39:7 57:5 61:9
83:20 87:22	32:2,8,16 99:3	105:14 106:2	105:16 106:15	<b>volunteers</b> 62:18	106:8	61:12,13,19
91:20 92:12	<b>tomorrow</b> 97:10	112:7	<b>unregulated</b>	<b>Vos</b> 102:17	<b>weird</b> 85:19	62:4,7,12 63:7
96:5 106:25	<b>tone</b> 57:8	<b>type</b> 56:7	46:1		<b>welcomed</b> 54:11	69:10 78:2
<b>threshold</b> 23:22	<b>top</b> 10:1 60:8	<b>types</b> 70:12	<b>unrelated</b> 39:13	<b>W</b>	<b>well-known</b> 13:7	93:18 94:7
<b>thrust</b> 65:10	<b>topic</b> 5:15 7:23	<b>typically</b> 110:13	<b>unsuccessful</b>	<b>W</b> 110:7	111:24	98:25 99:23
<b>thumbnail</b>	<b>topless</b> 70:21	<b>t's</b> 42:18	105:3	<b>waiting</b> 72:6	<b>went</b> 16:7 22:19	108:4,5
100:18	<b>total</b> 46:7 50:20	<b>T-Mobile</b> 102:25	<b>untrue</b> 42:12	<b>walk</b> 85:19 98:12	25:14 29:3	<b>witnesses</b> 4:13
<b>tightrope</b> 98:14	<b>touched</b> 80:17		68:10,13 76:18	<b>wall</b> 10:19	31:1,20 32:3	82:1 99:16
98:22	<b>touches</b> 44:8	<b>U</b>	<b>untruthful</b> 67:17	<b>wan</b> 55:24	35:8,13 38:23	<b>woman</b> 17:3,5
<b>time</b> 1:6 7:9 8:9	72:11	<b>ultimate</b> 33:3	67:20 68:9	<b>waned</b> 89:16	81:19,25 82:13	<b>won</b> 28:9,9
9:24 10:1 14:1	<b>tough</b> 75:7,16,18	34:13 53:15	<b>untruths</b> 92:10	<b>want</b> 2:14 3:25	91:12 95:6,18	<b>wonder</b> 2:10 8:5
14:14 15:2,25	<b>trade</b> 22:17,18	<b>ultimately</b> 29:13	<b>update</b> 96:25	6:25 7:18 8:24	100:24 101:6	108:11
16:2,3,5,15,15	<b>traffic</b> 53:12	33:21 50:6	<b>uplift</b> 54:16,18	11:25 15:6	101:14 104:13	<b>wonderful</b> 20:1
16:20 17:10,22	109:20 110:3	51:16 58:10	<b>upped</b> 22:23	34:25 36:16	104:13,14	<b>wonders</b> 110:17
18:8 25:10	112:21	83:6	<b>upset</b> 19:24	46:5,6 49:16	<b>weren't</b> 42:5	<b>word</b> 56:9 59:10
26:7,23,23	<b>train</b> 102:4,5	<b>ultimatum</b> 36:20	<b>upshot</b> 36:2	51:2,3,15	72:18 78:4	61:6,7 85:9
27:4 28:23	<b>trains</b> 102:2,9	<b>unable</b> 74:22	<b>urgent</b> 94:18,19	85:22 86:6,7	<b>we'll</b> 1:25 22:16	105:11
30:2,21 31:3	<b>transcript</b> 58:24	<b>unacceptable</b>	94:21	92:15 93:18,21	23:5 55:14	<b>worded</b> 97:4
31:24 32:19	60:12	70:17	<b>URN30982</b>	106:15	61:21,22 62:3	<b>words</b> 5:9 30:7
33:12,15 35:2	<b>travelling</b> 102:10	<b>undergraduate</b>	63:10	<b>wanted</b> 3:15,24	62:4 74:18	45:13 89:19
43:8 55:24	<b>tread</b> 61:3	51:24	<b>use</b> 23:10	21:8,12 27:16	75:13 96:8	112:2
56:1 60:24	106:13	<b>undermined</b>	<b>useful</b> 56:25	31:19 36:16	100:12 110:21	<b>work</b> 2:4 9:2
62:8 63:1	<b>treatment</b> 41:18	26:12	<b>usual</b> 112:1	45:24 59:9	114:20	13:6,24,24
64:11,24 65:17	43:4	<b>undermining</b>	<b>usually</b> 110:11	67:18 86:8	<b>we're</b> 19:7 26:16	14:1 36:25
66:6 67:4	<b>trespassing</b>	53:11	112:22	96:3 111:12	46:21 52:3,21	48:16 50:4
69:21,25 70:5	108:16	<b>understand</b> 1:24	<b>utterly</b> 53:10	<b>wants</b> 88:16	60:13,14 62:5	54:11 64:15,16
71:23 72:5,22	<b>trial</b> 22:25 27:23	5:14,16 7:1,3,9		<b>warned</b> 43:10	73:20 82:24	64:18,23,25
73:11,21 75:6	28:6 83:7,8	7:20 8:18	<b>V</b>	<b>warning</b> 39:22	84:22 94:9	77:21 95:8,13



<p>95:18 100:25 101:6 <b>worked</b> 28:2 64:24 <b>working</b> 4:9 26:22 27:3 35:2 51:10 84:16 107:24 109:21 111:7 113:23 <b>works</b> 106:18 <b>world</b> 17:24,25 18:8 19:12 21:8 23:25 24:3 28:2 29:2 40:2 43:4 45:19,21,22 74:14 84:17 103:19 105:10 113:24 114:5 <b>World's</b> 40:3 109:16 <b>worse</b> 41:9 66:21 66:23 <b>worth</b> 22:24 23:1 37:12 92:4 <b>worthwhile</b> 102:8 112:23 <b>wouldn't</b> 1:16 18:9 20:4 34:5 39:19 51:12 57:13 74:9 78:11 83:21 85:9 86:17 110:14 <b>wraps</b> 84:11 <b>write</b> 81:18 96:18 112:4,5 112:12 <b>writer</b> 100:21 101:1 <b>writing</b> 42:12 78:12 100:21 113:4,8 <b>written</b> 40:6,7,14 41:21 64:10,12 66:6 87:2 90:19 100:11 101:19 111:9 <b>wrong</b> 14:14 36:10 48:10 86:25 88:6,7 89:10 <b>wrote</b> 101:7,17 111:18 113:1,5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>X</b></p> <p><b>X</b> 55:21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>Yates</b> 38:20,21 <b>yeah</b> 64:14 68:2 68:6 69:7,13 71:7 73:8,18 74:3 78:19 91:5,8 100:20 114:2</p>	<p><b>year</b> 12:17 38:9 95:15 102:6,18 102:22 <b>years</b> 20:18 65:12 66:18 70:18 73:18,19 76:10 81:18 85:14 91:8 92:2 100:20 101:4,25 <b>yesterday</b> 1:6 2:16 5:2 9:21 14:5 20:1 48:8 103:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Z</b></p> <p><b>zone</b> 41:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1</b> 12:17 102:3 <b>1.01</b> 114:22 <b>10</b> 22:19 25:10 36:19 55:6 66:1 68:4 <b>10,000</b> 22:3 49:12 <b>10.00</b> 1:2 <b>100</b> 29:3 30:9,16 54:16,18 100:11,16 105:7 107:7 109:19 <b>100,000</b> 51:6,7,9 <b>11</b> 36:21 66:17 76:10 <b>11,000</b> 108:24 <b>11.30</b> 56:21 <b>11.41</b> 56:23 <b>12</b> 25:11 <b>12.30</b> 93:17 <b>13</b> 36:19 49:7 69:11 <b>14</b> 1:14 49:7 78:3 80:22 105:4 <b>15</b> 22:20 <b>16</b> 79:15 <b>17</b> 65:12 68:4 79:22 <b>19</b> 66:18 105:3 <b>1970s</b> 101:20 <b>1980s</b> 100:21 101:20 <b>1990</b> 63:23 <b>1991</b> 63:24 65:10 71:15 <b>1992</b> 84:7 <b>1995</b> 70:20 <b>1996</b> 63:25 64:1 72:25 73:23 <b>1997</b> 72:14 101:5 <b>1998</b> 63:25 64:19 71:15 <b>1999</b> 64:19,22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2</b> 13:23 18:21 20:3,3,8 94:18</p>	<p>105:6,7 114:20 <b>20</b> 85:13 <b>20,000</b> 23:6 28:16 <b>200,000</b> 83:15 <b>2000</b> 85:7,8 <b>2001</b> 13:20,23 74:14 85:8 101:14 <b>2002</b> 74:15 111:6 <b>2003</b> 111:7 <b>2004</b> 95:11,14 <b>2005</b> 104:13 111:18 <b>2006</b> 57:19 113:1 <b>2009</b> 34:15 36:19 38:11 76:9,10 77:24 <b>2010</b> 66:18 83:8 <b>2011</b> 1:1 95:15 100:3 104:5 <b>21</b> 28:8 60:2 82:24 113:21 <b>218</b> 12:13 <b>22</b> 70:14,18 114:16 <b>23</b> 1:1 59:24 60:1 71:4 <b>24</b> 73:12 <b>25</b> 29:19 <b>250,000</b> 22:10,15 23:1 29:6,8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p><b>3</b> 42:13 63:19 <b>30</b> 41:10 100:20 <b>34</b> 36:1,12 <b>35</b> 41:9 <b>36</b> 23:3,4,6 27:18 27:20,22 28:5 28:16,19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p><b>4</b> 57:18 63:22 <b>4.30</b> 9:21 <b>40</b> 14:1 <b>400,000</b> 51:5 <b>425,000</b> 29:14,15 31:5 <b>49</b> 39:7 57:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5</b> 12:19 14:21,22 65:8 <b>50</b> 20:17 105:13 <b>50,000</b> 27:17,23 28:5,5,9,12,19 29:3 <b>500,000</b> 28:13 51:4 <b>56</b> 43:5 58:17 <b>57</b> 41:20 58:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6</b> 39:16 <b>6,000</b> 25:7</p>	<p><b>60</b> 82:20 100:11 100:15 105:6 <b>600,000</b> 51:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7</b></p> <p><b>70</b> 82:20,21</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8</b></p> <p><b>8</b> 5:10 8:11,16 68:5 <b>84</b> 20:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></p> <p><b>9th</b> 100:3 <b>90</b> 54:12</p>			
--	---	---	---	--	--	--