

1  
2 (2.00 pm)  
3 MR JAY: Sir, the next witness is Mr Hugh Grant, please.  
4 MR HUGH JOHN MUNGO GRANT (affirmed)  
5 Questions from by MR JAY  
6 MR JAY: Mr Grant, your full name, please?  
7 A. Hugh John Mungo Grant.  
8 Q. Mr Grant, we've prepared a bundle for you and you'll  
9 find, please, under tab 1, your first witness statement,  
10 which is dated and signed by you with a statement of  
11 truth on 3 November of this year. I invite you to take  
12 that to hand, please, and confirm that that is your  
13 first statement.  
14 A. It is.  
15 Q. Then you gave a second statement, a supplementary  
16 witness statement, on 11 November, and again made  
17 a statement of truth.  
18 A. Yes.  
19 Q. What I'm going to do, Mr Grant --  
20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Before you do anything --  
21 MR JAY: Yes.  
22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Grant, as with some of the other  
23 witnesses, I'm very grateful to you for coming. I am  
24 extremely conscious that you are speaking about matters  
25 which you would prefer were not deployed in the press,

Page 1

1 and that that is a difficult decision and a difficult  
2 experience for you. I'm conscious of it and I'm  
3 grateful to you for assisting the Inquiry with your  
4 evidence.  
5 During the course of the afternoon, we're likely to  
6 have a break, but if at any stage you feel that you want  
7 just a few minutes off, you don't have to say "cut",  
8 it's sufficient if you indicate it and I'll be  
9 pleased --  
10 A. Thank you.  
11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- to accord you that time.  
12 A. Thank you very much.  
13 MR JAY: We're not time limited, Mr Grant. We have the  
14 whole afternoon.  
15 A. I'm sorry to hear that.  
16 Q. Your evidence subdivides, if I may say so, into evidence  
17 of fact and evidence of opinion. I'd like to start,  
18 please, with the evidence of fact, do you follow me,  
19 before we move on to the opinions.  
20 A. Yes.  
21 Q. In relation to your career, everybody, of course,  
22 probably knows all about your career, but you made it  
23 big, if I can so describe it, with a film in 1994, "Four  
24 Weddings and a Funeral", but although you don't say so  
25 yourself, you did rather well, I think, with another

Page 2

1 film which some of us enjoyed in 1987 called "Maurice",  
2 so it wasn't as if it's a one-off. Your career then took  
3 off thereafter.  
4 You say in your statement that following the success  
5 of "Four Weddings and a Funeral" in 1994, initially the  
6 press comment was favourable and then it plummeted. Can  
7 you tell us a bit about the favourable part, the good  
8 part, if we can so describe it, in your own words,  
9 please?  
10 A. Well, it was fairly brief, but of course on the back of  
11 that success of "Four Weddings and a Funeral", yes,  
12 there was a spirit of goodwill. I think the nation  
13 liked having a film that was making -- that was popular  
14 and funny and doing very well all over the world. You  
15 know, we enjoy the few British cinema successes we get  
16 and I got a little blip of positive press on the back of  
17 that, yes.  
18 Q. At that stage, was there any interest in your private  
19 life, do you think?  
20 A. There was a great deal of interest suddenly in my  
21 private life.  
22 Q. Yes?  
23 A. Particularly beginning at the premiere of that film,  
24 when the press became very interested in me and my  
25 girlfriend.

Page 3

1 Q. Yes. Okay, I think we probably remember that premiere.  
2 A. Yes.  
3 Q. Can I move on to perhaps the darker side. This is  
4 paragraph 7 of your witness statement.  
5 A. Yes.  
6 Q. I'm not going to cover the events of July 1995. We're  
7 not interested in that.  
8 A. I wish you would, in a way, simply because -- am  
9 I allowed to break in on you?  
10 Q. Of course, yes.  
11 A. Just because I think it's an important point that I make  
12 in this statement, that all the questioning and  
13 campaigning I've done recently about what I see as the  
14 abuses of some sections of the British press is  
15 emphatically not motivated by the treatment I got when  
16 I was arrested in 1995. I say in my statement here  
17 I was arrested, it was on public record, I totally  
18 expected there to be tons of press, a press storm. That  
19 happened, and I have no quarrel with it, none  
20 whatsoever. I just thought it's important to make that  
21 point.  
22 Q. Fair enough.  
23 There was an incident involving a break-in to your  
24 London flat on the fourth floor?  
25 A. Yes.

Page 4

<p>1 Q. The front door was forced off its hinges. It sounds as                  2 if it was professionally done. There was no damage                  3 inside the flat; is that correct?                  4 A. No damage and nothing was stolen.                  5 Q. Yes.                  6 A. This came at the zenith of the sort of press storm                  7 around that arrest in Los Angeles. I was now back in                  8 London, holed up in my flat, and I'd managed to get out                  9 for the day, or the night -- I can't remember. Anyway,                  10 when I came back, this flat had been broken into. The                  11 front door had been basically just shoved off its                  12 hinges. As I say, nothing was stolen, which was weird,                  13 and the police nevertheless came around the next day to                  14 talk about it, and the day after that a detailed account                  15 of what the interior of my flat looked like appeared in                  16 one of the British tabloid papers. I can't remember                  17 which one at the moment, but it was definitely there,                  18 and I remember thinking: who told them that? Was that                  19 the burglar or was that the police? And when I told                  20 this story to Tom Watson recently, the MP who was                  21 writing a book about this kind of thing, he nodded                  22 knowingly, saying, "Oh yes, that particular method of                  23 break-in I've come across with several other people who                  24 are victims of a lot of -- in the crosshairs of a lot of                  25 the press attention, and it doesn't seem to have been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 I know they were desperate to get some kind of access.                  2 MR JAY: At paragraph 8 and following you deal with various                  3 libel actions, all of which were successful. Can you                  4 assist us, please, with a general idea of how many libel                  5 claims we're talking about?                  6 A. I don't know. It's been 16, 17 years since "Four                  7 Weddings", since I became of any kind of interest to the                  8 tabloid press, and I would imagine that in those 17                  9 years that, I don't know, half a dozen, maybe more,                  10 maybe 10. I've got -- my lawyer's over there. You                  11 could ask him. He'd know.                  12 Q. Yes.                  13 A. I just mention two here out of those because it would be                  14 very boring to go through them all, and in themselves                  15 they're not significant, but these two particular                  16 examples I think are significant.                  17 Q. Yes. The example you give in paragraph 11, February                  18 2007 --                  19 A. Yeah.                  20 Q. -- the plummy-voiced woman issue.                  21 A. Mm.                  22 Q. Are you suggesting there that the story must have come                  23 from phone hacking?                  24 A. Well, what I say in this paragraph is that the Mail on                  25 Sunday ran an article in February 2007 saying that my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 a singular occasion."                  2 And you know, it seemed doubly sinister to me                  3 because that flat, as you said, is -- you have to walk                  4 up a hell of a lot of stairs to get there. I think it                  5 was a very bad choice for a normal burglar, and nothing                  6 was stolen, and I've had it for 25 years and it's never                  7 been broken into before or since.                  8 Q. In terms of the logical possibilities, I suppose it's                  9 either, in no particular order, a leak from the police                  10 or it might be the burglar was acting on the                  11 instructions of the press to gain sight of the inside of                  12 your flat. We don't know which hypothesis is the                  13 correct one.                  14 A. Well, or both.                  15 Q. Or both.                  16 A. I think the most likely scenario is both.                  17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or, alternatively, a burglar who has                  18 found whose flat he's burgled and decided there's some                  19 way he can make some money. Whatever. I'm not --                  20 A. Fine. Fine. But they were very -- you know, this was                  21 at a time when there was a lot of press outside all the                  22 time, desperate to get in. It was the middle of the                  23 summer and I know they were listening. You know, it was                  24 right up, four floors up and they could actually hear                  25 one or two of the rows I was having at the time, so</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 relationship with my then girlfriend, Jemima Khan, was                  2 on the rocks because of my persistent late-night                  3 flirtatious phonecalls with a plummy-voiced studio                  4 executive from Warner Brothers, and it was a bizarre                  5 story, completely untrue, that I sued for libel over and                  6 won and damages were awarded, a statement was made in                  7 open court.                  8 But thinking about how they could possibly come up                  9 with such a bizarre left-field story, I realised that                  10 although there was no plummy-voiced studio executive                  11 from Warner Brothers with whom I'd had any kind of                  12 relationship, flirtatious or otherwise, there was                  13 a great friend of mine in Los Angeles who runs                  14 a production company which is associated with Warner                  15 Brothers and whose assistant is a charming married                  16 middle-aged lady, English, who, as happens in Hollywood,                  17 is the person who rings you. The executive never rings                  18 you. It's always their assistant: "Hi, we have Jack                  19 Bealy(?) on the phone for you." And this is what she                  20 used to do. She used to call and she used to leave                  21 messages and because she was a nice English girl in LA,                  22 sometimes when we spoke, we'd have a chat about English                  23 stuff, Marmite or whatever.                  24 So she would leave charming, jokey messages saying,                  25 "Please call this studio executive back", and she has</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 a voice that could only be described as plummy. So</p> <p>2 I cannot for the life of me think of any conceivable</p> <p>3 source for this story in the Mail on Sunday except those</p> <p>4 voice messages on my mobile telephone.</p> <p>5 Q. You haven't alleged that before, have you, in the public</p> <p>6 domain?</p> <p>7 A. No, but when I was preparing this statement and going</p> <p>8 through all my old trials and tribulations with the</p> <p>9 press, I looked at that one again and thought that is</p> <p>10 weird, and then the penny dropped.</p> <p>11 Q. I think the highest it can be put is, frankly, it's</p> <p>12 a piece of speculation on your part, isn't it, in</p> <p>13 relation to this?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, you could -- yes, speculation, okay, but I would</p> <p>15 love to know -- I mean, I think Mr Caplan, who</p> <p>16 represents Associated, was saying earlier today that</p> <p>17 he'd like to put in a supplementary statement and -- you</p> <p>18 know, referring to the things I say today. Well, I'd</p> <p>19 love to hear what the Daily Mail's or the Sunday Mail's</p> <p>20 explanation for that article is, what that source was,</p> <p>21 if it wasn't phone hacking.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. I may come back to that, but I'll leave that for</p> <p>23 the time being.</p> <p>24 The next article you refer to is in paragraph 12 of</p> <p>25 your statement, which is one in the Sunday Express. The</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 Q. Details of which it's probably unnecessary to go into,</p> <p>2 but it did culminate in a claim against the Mirror for</p> <p>3 breach of confidence and you got judgment from</p> <p>4 Mr Justice Wright; that's correct, isn't it?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. You also complained to the PCC and that claim was</p> <p>7 upheld, was it not?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, finally, after a lot of effort. I mean, it took</p> <p>9 months and months. They were very reluctant to do</p> <p>10 anything. Finally, I got a tiny recognition that my</p> <p>11 complaint had been upheld deep in the newspaper.</p> <p>12 Q. Right.</p> <p>13 A. Without referring to what the complaint was about.</p> <p>14 Q. Could I take that in stages? The PCC adjudication you</p> <p>15 will have in the bundle we have prepared for you, under</p> <p>16 tab 4.</p> <p>17 A. Yes. This will take me hours.</p> <p>18 Q. It won't.</p> <p>19 A. Tab 4. Okay, I see, all right. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. They upheld the privacy complaint but they noted, you'll</p> <p>21 see in the second paragraph:</p> <p>22 "The complainant also raised a number of issues</p> <p>23 arising from the complaint, involving confidentiality</p> <p>24 and sources of information which were outside the</p> <p>25 Commission's remit."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 point about this article -- and we have it in HG1 on the</p> <p>2 internal numbering at page 3 but on the numbering at the</p> <p>3 bottom right-hand side, a number ending 1921 -- is that</p> <p>4 this article was entirely untrue.</p> <p>5 A. Yes, it's an article that purported to be written by me</p> <p>6 and which I hadn't written. Nor had I done that thing</p> <p>7 that, you know, happens a lot in papers, where it's</p> <p>8 someone talking to someone. I had not even spoken to</p> <p>9 a journalist. It was completely, as far as I could see,</p> <p>10 either made up or patched and pasted from previous</p> <p>11 quotations I might have given in interview.</p> <p>12 Q. Right.</p> <p>13 A. That is why, as I recall, the Express lost their case</p> <p>14 and had to apologise.</p> <p>15 Q. This statement in open court makes precisely that point,</p> <p>16 that you did not contribute to the article in any way</p> <p>17 and the Express admitted that.</p> <p>18 A. Mm.</p> <p>19 Q. Those are the two examples of defamation claims. You</p> <p>20 also provide examples of privacy claims.</p> <p>21 A. Mm.</p> <p>22 Q. The first one of these over which there was litigation</p> <p>23 was paragraph 13 of your witness statement, a visit to</p> <p>24 Charing Cross Hospital.</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 And then at the bottom:</p> <p>2 "The Commission regretted the delay."</p> <p>3 That was to do with resolving issues of</p> <p>4 jurisdiction. So rightly or wrongly -- I don't think</p> <p>5 it's going to be possible for us to go into this --</p> <p>6 there were questions raised as to whether your complaint</p> <p>7 fell within the remit of the PCC and it took them time</p> <p>8 to resolve those questions. Once they resolved the</p> <p>9 questions, they upheld that part of the complaint which</p> <p>10 they felt they could deal with. Do you understand that?</p> <p>11 A. I understand that that's what they wrote.</p> <p>12 Q. Yes.</p> <p>13 A. But I fail entirely to understand how an individual's</p> <p>14 medical records being appropriated and printed for</p> <p>15 commercial profit could not come under the remit of the</p> <p>16 PCC. If that doesn't come under the remit of the PCC,</p> <p>17 what the hell is the PCC for?</p> <p>18 Q. I think they were saying it did.</p> <p>19 A. Yes, but why did it take them so long?</p> <p>20 Q. It was other matters they were saying -- they don't</p> <p>21 identify what those matters were -- that may be outside</p> <p>22 of the remit, but your essential complaint -- you can</p> <p>23 see that in the first paragraph of the adjudication,</p> <p>24 confidential medical information about you was</p> <p>25 published -- that's the complaint they eventually</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 focused on and they upheld it. Do you follow?                  2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We don't know from this document the                  3 date of this adjudication. Everybody agrees -- well,                  4 you've said, but we can't agree it, that it took a long                  5 time but do you know the date? Do you remember                  6 approximately how long it took? The date isn't on it.                  7 A. My recollection is that it's about three months, but --                  8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Doubtless somebody will be able to                  9 tell us at some stage.                  10 A. Yes.                  11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Don't worry about it.                  12 MR JAY: There's another similar complaint, or rather issue,                  13 and you touched on this in paragraph 15 of your                  14 statement. It's much more recent. It involves a visit                  15 to the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital in March of this                  16 year.                  17 A. Yes.                  18 Q. First of all, Mr Grant, are you happy that we talk about                  19 that?                  20 A. Yes, otherwise I wouldn't have put it in the statement.                  21 Q. Fair enough. The article itself is under HG1. The                  22 internal numbering is page 14. It's a longer number at                  23 the bottom right-hand side of the page. It's the number                  24 ending 1932. HG1 is tab 2, Mr Grant.                  25 A. Thank you. 1932.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 to me is a gross intrusion in my privacy and they have                  2 deliberately dressed that up as a flattering article                  3 about how undiva-ish I was to try and get away with                  4 that.                  5 Q. I'll come back to further comment on it, but it ended up                  6 with The Sun either paying damages or paying to                  7 a charity; is that right?                  8 A. Yeah. It wasn't just the Sun who ran that piece. The                  9 Express ran a piece similar, as I recall, and as I say                  10 in my statement, by that stage of my life -- this was                  11 only this year, wasn't it? I think it was this year.                  12 I was weary and, to a certain degree, wary of endless                  13 lawsuits against tabloids. They take a long time,                  14 there's a lot of stress. So I tried to shortcircuit it                  15 by offering them: "Look, there'll be no lawsuit if you                  16 just each pay £5,000 to a charity which I support called                  17 Healthtalkonline", and seeing as they had both talked                  18 about my health online, I thought that was elegant. The                  19 Express flatly refused to pay a penny, and after much                  20 protesting, the Sun gave the charity £1,500.                  21 Q. Is this your point, Mr Grant, that it doesn't matter                  22 whether the underlying story is true; the point is it's                  23 an invasion of your privacy and there is not a public                  24 interest in people putting out articles about your                  25 health? Is that your point in a nutshell?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 Q. Yes.                  2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's a 14 just above it.                  3 A. Okay. Yes, I have it.                  4 MR JAY: I'm going to ask you to comment about this. The                  5 details probably don't matter. You ended up in the                  6 Accident &amp; Emergency department of this hospital. What                  7 the article is saying, or may be trying to say, is that                  8 here was a famous man, he didn't pull rank, he waited                  9 his turn in the queue. We all know from these A&amp;E                  10 departments that you sometimes have to wait a long time,                  11 particularly if it's not serious. You made no                  12 complaint. This all reflects rather well on you. Do                  13 you follow that? That's what they were trying to get                  14 at.                  15 A. Yes, but that's not my interpretation of the story.                  16 Q. Okay.                  17 A. The classic tabloid technique to cover a really                  18 egregious breach of someone's privacy is to wrap it up                  19 in a nice story. So if they photograph someone's baby,                  20 they'll say, "Oh, what a pretty baby" to try and stop                  21 the parents suing them for breach of privacy.                  22 This is exactly the same. This is an article which                  23 says not only that I went to hospital for but what                  24 I went for. It's my medical record. It's the exact                  25 complaint, that I was dizzy and short of breath, which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 A. I think no one would expect -- no British citizen would                  2 expect their medical records to be made public or to be                  3 appropriated by newspapers for commercial profit.                  4 I think that's fundamental to our British sense of                  5 decency.                  6 Q. No. To be fair to the Sun, we don't know the source of                  7 the story from the article itself.                  8 A. No, maybe it was just a lucky guess.                  9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think they're probably                  10 suggesting that, but it could be a number of different                  11 cases.                  12 A. What would they be, sir?                  13 MR JAY: There could well be evidence about this later, but                  14 the story apparently came from a picture agency who had                  15 been tipped off by a non-medical employee at the                  16 hospital. Could that be true?                  17 A. Well, there was no picture, so that bit's a little                  18 weird.                  19 Q. Right.                  20 A. But for them to know my medical -- the details of why                  21 I went there, it must have been someone with access to                  22 the computer where you register. I hope and I'm sure it                  23 was none of the medical staff, who I have to say were                  24 fantastic in that hospital, as they always are, but                  25 I suspect that it was the age-old system of someone at</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 the hospital being on a retainer from either a tabloid                  2 newspaper or perhaps a picture agency. You know: "If                  3 anyone famous comes in, tell us and here's 50 quid or                  4 500 quid", or whatever it is I am quite sure -- well, my                  5 opinion is that that was the source, as it had been back                  6 in June 1996, and as it was again recently in the case                  7 of my baby.</p> <p>8 Q. In paragraphs 16 and 17 of your statement, you deal with                  9 other intrusions on your privacy, which I think we'll                  10 just, if you don't mind, take as read. I would like to                  11 move on to paragraph 18 and the section about paparazzi.                  12 You give one example at the bottom of paragraph 18                  13 about being chased at high speed. Your girlfriend was.                  14 Could you tell us a little bit more about that?</p> <p>15 A. That was a relatively common occurrence with two of the                  16 girlfriends I've had. They both have children and in                  17 both cases -- actually, that's not quite fair. The                  18 first girlfriend, when she was with me, we didn't have                  19 children, so that doesn't apply, but the second                  20 girlfriend -- although that first girlfriend has                  21 subsequently had children and been very badly chased and                  22 abused, but the second girlfriend, she did have children                  23 and she was frequently, especially in the early days of                  24 our romance, followed and chased, even when she had her                  25 children in the car and even when the children were not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 pictures up girls' skirts and then digitally remove                  2 their underwear because they can sell the picture for                  3 a little more if they do that. I suspect they are the                  4 ones who were following Princess Diana when she died and                  5 whom the tabloid papers, particularly the Daily Mail,                  6 promised they would never buy pictures from again but                  7 which they subsequently did, about three months later.</p> <p>8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Not now, but I'd like to come back to                  9 the mechanisms whereby any of that can be controlled,                  10 just for your view on it. Not now. Mr Jay will come to                  11 it.</p> <p>12 A. Sure.</p> <p>13 MR JAY: If we move on to the issue of hacking, Mr Grant,                  14 which you cover in some detail.</p> <p>15 To set the scene, you tell us in paragraph 24 that                  16 warnings started to come through from media lawyers                  17 about how to protect privacy, and amongst the advice                  18 they gave was that phone numbers should be changed                  19 frequently and voicemails set on PINs other than                  20 defaults. Can you remember when those warnings started                  21 to emanate?</p> <p>22 A. I can't exactly, but I mean I'm guessing it was early                  23 2000s, you know? Sort of 2000 to 2005, that kind of                  24 time.</p> <p>25 Q. Right. Were you the direct recipient of such warnings?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 enjoying it, crying. They pulled up for petrol, they'd                  2 ask the paparazzi who pulled in and started taking                  3 pictures: "Please go away, there's children in this car                  4 and they're frightened", and these paparazzi would                  5 continue to take pictures and then they'd be bought by                  6 one of the national newspapers.</p> <p>7 Q. The paparazzi presumably were working freelance?</p> <p>8 A. Yes. As I explain in this statement, there are two                  9 kinds of press photographers. There are either ones who                  10 are on staff for the papers. They just occasionally                  11 show a modicum of decency, although they didn't in the                  12 case of, recently, my baby. They staked out a new                  13 mother for three days. She couldn't really leave her                  14 home.</p> <p>15 And then there are the much worse freelance                  16 paparazzi who are increasingly -- well, the police tell                  17 me they are increasingly recruited from criminal classes                  18 and very often they have criminal records, they have                  19 been in different fields of crime previous to being                  20 paparazzi and who will really stop the nothing, who show                  21 no mercy, no ethics, because the bounty on some of these                  22 pictures is very high, and I suspect that the ones who,                  23 for instance, were chasing my girlfriend and her                  24 children, were those freelance types. I suspect they                  25 were the ones who try to -- who always try to take</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 A. I had circular emails that were sent from Schillings,                  2 the media lawyers, to lots of clients and to ex-clients.                  3 I think I might have been an ex-client of Schillings by                  4 then -- I can't remember -- and I remember looking at                  5 this list. It was just a warning, saying, "These are                  6 some of the things they're up to. Be careful of                  7 Bluetooth, be careful of your PIN numbers, be careful of                  8 your phones", and so on. "Get your car swept."</p> <p>9 Q. Then, paragraph 25, you say it was about 2004 when                  10 someone came from the Information Commissioner's office?</p> <p>11 A. Yes, out of the blue.</p> <p>12 Q. Can you remember whether it was a policeman who came or                  13 was it an official from the Information Commissioner?</p> <p>14 A. To be honest with you, I've always been confused about                  15 that. He was not wearing a uniform, but for some reason                  16 I've always told the story as a policeman, and maybe he                  17 had a rank or something. I wish I could tell you                  18 accurately and I can't find -- I've looked everywhere                  19 for the details of the meeting. I mean, it definitely                  20 happened. I didn't make it up. He came to my house, he                  21 sat in my kitchen and he told me that they had arrested                  22 a private detective, a private investigator, who --                  23 whose notebook contained intimate personal details on                  24 a number of people and I was one of them. And that it                  25 contained my address, the address of my -- some close</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

<p>1 friends, relations. I remember him saying phone                  2 numbers, although I know you're about to contest that,                  3 but I can't imagine they'd come to tell me they had my                  4 address because everyone had my address. I said, "Who's                  5 this person working for?" And he said, "Well, it looks                  6 from his notebook like he's working for most of the                  7 British press."                  8 Q. Yes, which might suggest it was the                  9 Information Commissioner's office rather than                  10 Mr Mulcaire, but --                  11 A. I'm sure it was. I'm sure it wasn't Mulcaire --                  12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think you'll find the                  13 Information Commissioner employs ex-police officers.                  14 MR JAY: Yes.                  15 A. Yes, we know that because there was the story recently                  16 in the Independent about one of those police officers                  17 who was shocked that at the end of this particular                  18 inquiry, they weren't allowed to interview any of the                  19 journalists who had hired the private detective in the                  20 first place.                  21 MR JAY: You're in danger of foreshadowing evidence we'll be                  22 hearing next week from the relevant person, but what                  23 I need to put to you, Mr Grant, is that it's clearly the                  24 Information Commissioner's office's position that they                  25 never discovered any evidence relating to phone hacking.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 to leave it. We'll have to park that issue. Certainly                  2 they were telling me about blagging and that kind of                  3 thing, certainly.                  4 Q. Was that the phrase they used?                  5 A. I can't remember. It was 2004. But it was --                  6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think you ought to assume                  7 that Mr Jay is agreeing or disagreeing. The fact it                  8 that as I'm sure you appreciate, it's very important                  9 that those others who are going to give evidence -- some                  10 of them have seen parts of what you've said in order to                  11 comment.                  12 A. Yes.                  13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And part of the system is that you                  14 are asked about their concerns so they can respond.                  15 A. Yes.                  16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But you will shouldn't assume that                  17 because Mr Jay is asking the question, he necessarily is                  18 agreeing with or disagreeing with the proposition he's                  19 putting to you.                  20 A. I understand.                  21 MR JAY: Was Mr Wittamore's name mentioned by the gentleman,                  22 ex-policeman or otherwise, from the                  23 Information Commissioner's office?                  24 A. I don't think so. But seeing as that whole Inquiry was                  25 about the Wittamore arrest, it's difficult to imagine</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 So if that's right, it would suggest that your                  2 recollection must be incorrect and you must be confusing                  3 this with the Mulcaire notebooks and not the Wittamore                  4 notebooks.                  5 A. I know that this wasn't the Mulcaire case that came to                  6 me. As I said to you before, I cannot understand why                  7 they would come and tell me that a man had my address,                  8 because everyone had my address. The paps were out                  9 there, you know, all the time.                  10 Q. Yes.                  11 A. So if he didn't also have my phone numbers at the very                  12 least -- and I think he said PIN numbers as well -- then                  13 I don't understand why he'd come to see me.                  14 Q. Can I just break that down? Having your address,                  15 although it may not be that difficult a piece of data to                  16 obtain, could be attained in breach of the Data                  17 Protection Act. Do you follow me?                  18 A. Yeah, yeah.                  19 Q. And it may be that you are associating what could have                  20 been a reasonably limited if not unremarkable discussion                  21 which was limited to breaches of the Data Protection Act                  22 and then extrapolating from that and bringing in more                  23 sinister details about PIN numbers and possible evidence                  24 of voicemail hacking. Do you see that?                  25 A. We're obviously not going to agree on this so we'll have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 that it was about anyone else.                  2 Q. Yes, you learned that subsequently, didn't you?                  3 A. Yes.                  4 Q. The next event was a chance encounter with a Mr Paul                  5 McMullan, Mr Grant, and you deal with that in                  6 paragraph 26 of your witness statement.                  7 A. Yes.                  8 Q. Tell us about the chance encounter. We've read about                  9 it, but you ended up in the same car as him, didn't you?                  10 A. Yes. I broke down --                  11 Q. Yes.                  12 A. -- in my car in Kent, in the remotest countryside just                  13 before Christmas last year, and thought: "What am                  14 I going to do? I'm late for my appointment." And there                  15 was no taxis around, it was Christmassy, it was icy, and                  16 then amazingly a car -- van pulled up in the other                  17 carriageway of this dual carriageway, and I thought:                  18 "Good, some nice Kent-ish person has come to help", and                  19 instead out stepped a man with a great long lens.                  20 I thought: "I can't believe in the middle of Kent, in                  21 the middle of winter, there's a pap." And he came over                  22 and he took lots of pictures. I wasn't entirely polite                  23 to him. Then to my horror I realised there was no other                  24 way of getting to this appointment. He kept saying, "Do                  25 you want a lift?" and I thought: "I know this is in your</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 interests that I take the lift", so I kept saying no.  2 Finally I did, so then I was suddenly in the car with  3 this man with my friend, and that is when he revealed  4 that he was an ex-News of the World features editor who  5 is now retired and running a pub down in Dover and he  6 kept his camera in his glove box of his car just in case  7 of some happy accident, which he'd just encountered.  8 Then he went on to tell me all these fascinating  9 things -- boasting, really -- about how extensive phone  10 hacking had been at the News of the World, how  11 Andy Coulson had known about it for sure, how they had  12 enjoyed the competitive sycophancy of five successive  13 governments, of the way they paid off the police for  14 years, and I was thinking: "This is all amazing stuff.  15 I wish I had a tape recorder."  16 Then he dropped --  17 Q. So to cut a long story short, the next time you saw him,  18 you did have a tape recorder. That's right, isn't it?  19 A. Yes, that is right, yes.  20 Q. And indeed, there was a piece about it in the  21 New Statesman, which again is in our bundle, HG1. On  22 the internal numbering it's page 15, but on the longer  23 number it ends 1933.  24 A. Yeah.  25 Q. Quite a zippy title.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 revenge number on Paul McMullen, and I -- for me, that's  2 the issue closed with him, and when I've had now two  3 separate police inquiries, the one into police  4 corruption and the other one into phone hacking, they  5 have come to me and they have asked for the tape and  6 I've refused because that seems to me too harsh.  7 I don't want to be sending Paul McMullen to prison. In  8 addition to which, he has to be given some credit for  9 having been a whistleblower on all this stuff.  10 Q. Okay. We note that answer, but I have to continue with  11 your question.  12 A. Yes.  13 Q. "... it wasn't just the News of the World; it was, you  14 know, the -- the Mail?"  15 It was very much a leading question, Mr Grant,  16 wasn't it?  17 A. Yes.  18 Q. There was no evidence --  19 A. But I'm not a lawyer. I'm allowed to ask leading  20 questions.  21 Q. Fair enough. But there's no evidence that you have to  22 your personal knowledge that the Mail was involved in  23 this at all, is there?  24 A. Um ...  25 Q. I'm asking you to be very careful when you answer the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 A. Thank you.  2 Q. Is this, Mr Grant, a verbatim transcript of the tape  3 recording?  4 A. Yes. There are boring bits left out. I put in just all  5 the juicy bits.  6 Q. We've all read it and I'm not going to go over all of  7 it, you understand, but I have been asked to go over in  8 particular -- and I was in any event intending to do  9 so -- the very bottom of the first page.  10 A. Yes.  11 Q. You're chipping in. It reads at the moment:  12 "And ... it wasn't just the News of the World; it  13 was ..."  14 And then it continues. First of all, can you  15 remember what goes in the "..."?  16 A. No. That would be one of the boring bits. But I mean,  17 it's nothing sinister. Or it could be that the jukebox  18 was too loud at that point. The tape recording is quite  19 hard to hear, and I was only able to transcribe it, you  20 know, having just had the meeting.  21 Q. Yes. I suppose if necessary, we're not going to do it  22 now, but we could listen to it, if you agreed?  23 A. Well --  24 Q. Do you have a problem with that?  25 A. I do have a problem with that. I feel like I did my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 question. Don't share a speculation with us. Don't  2 share an opinion. We're looking for evidence. There  3 isn't any evidence, is there?  4 A. The evidence for the Daily Mail being involved in phone  5 hacking for me would be the article we spoke about  6 earlier, the plummy-voiced woman, and it would be Paul  7 McMullen's answer to this question.  8 Q. Okay. Let's look at the answer then:  9 "Oh, absolutely, yeah. When I went freelance in  10 2004, the biggest payers -- you'd have thought it would  11 be the News of the World, but actually it was at  12 Daily Mail. If I take a good picture, the first person  13 I go to is, such as in your case, the Mail on Sunday.  14 Did you see that story? The picture of you breaking  15 down. I ought to thank you for that. I got £3000."  16 He's talking there about selling a photograph of  17 you, isn't he?  18 A. Well, he segues into that, but I didn't leave anything  19 out and, you know, if it helps, you can come around to  20 my house and listen to the tape. I left nothing out  21 between "... it wasn't just News of the World; it was  22 you know, the Mail" and him answering:  23 "Oh, absolutely, yeah. When I went freelance in  24 2004, the biggest payers -- you'd have thought it was  25 the News of the World but actually, it was the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 Daily Mail."                  2 That is the sequence of the conversation. There's                  3 nothing left out.                  4 Q. So what you're asking us to do then is to read carefully                  5 what he says and interpret his answer, and certainly one                  6 highly reasonable interpretation of his answer is that                  7 he's limiting his comment, his evidence, if you like, to                  8 the selling of photographs, isn't he?                  9 A. As I said before, he segues in that answer straight on                  10 to photographs. He goes:                  11 "If I take a good picture, the first person I go to                  12 is ..."                  13 So I agree that it's strange syntax, it's a segue,                  14 but I have no reason to believe that his answer, "Oh,                  15 absolutely, yeah", referred to the Daily Mail being                  16 involved in phone hacking.                  17 Q. Okay, Mr Grant. I have to ask this blunt question.                  18 We'll hear from Mr McMullen and have his version. Had                  19 he been drinking?                  20 A. Had I been drinking?                  21 Q. No, had Mr McMullen been drinking?                  22 A. He didn't seem drunk at all.                  23 Q. He didn't?                  24 A. No.                  25 Q. And then you say:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 Q. But some of it is controversial in the sense, Mr Grant,                  2 that it names particular names of people who --                  3 A. So?                  4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, I'll explain. You know                  5 perfectly well there's a police investigation going on.                  6 A. Ah, well that, yes.                  7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I have to be extremely careful --                  8 A. I understand that.                  9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- that I don't prejudice any                  10 potential prosecution.                  11 A. Yes, of course.                  12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And I'm sure you wouldn't want to                  13 either.                  14 A. No, I wouldn't.                  15 MR JAY: It is right to say, in case I sound too coy, that                  16 this has been published in the New Statesman, it's in                  17 the public domain.                  18 A. Yeah.                  19 Q. Anybody can Google it.                  20 A. Yes.                  21 Q. And frankly, we'll leave it at that, if you don't mind.                  22 Are you saying, for clarity, Mr Grant, that if the                  23 Inquiry wanted to listen just to the bits of the tape                  24 which we have been discussing specifically, it's                  25 something which you would be comfortable with or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 "But would they, the Mail, buy a phone-hacked                  2 story?"                  3 Isn't that a bit of an odd question, given that he                  4 hadn't referred to a phone-hacked story?                  5 A. It's not an odd question at all, given that he'd just                  6 done this strange segue. So there's me trying to get                  7 him back on the interesting bits. It's not interesting                  8 that they bought photographs of me broken down; it's                  9 very interesting whether they were involved in phone                  10 hacking or not. So what I do is I immediately -- and                  11 there's no dot dot dots here -- I say, "but would they,                  12 the Mail, buy a phone-hacked story?" To which he                  13 answers:                  14 "For about four or five years, they've been                  15 absolutely cleaner than clean, and before that, they                  16 weren't. They were as dirty as anyone. They had the                  17 most money."                  18 Q. It's a matter for comment, but he's not given any                  19 details there of any specific phone hacking activity by                  20 the Daily Mail, has he?                  21 A. No.                  22 Q. Then we can read on. Some of the rest of what he says                  23 is quite controversial, so it's probably best if I don't                  24 read it out, but --                  25 A. I thought this Inquiry was full of controversy.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 uncomfortable with?                  2 A. Those bits, yes, because I don't think they send                  3 McMullen to prison, so it's fine.                  4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I ought to make clear I'm not being                  5 too coy about the investigation. I've made some rulings                  6 about how we're going to go and we're going to do it,                  7 but I don't want to add unnecessary material into the                  8 public domain beyond that which it's necessary for me to                  9 go to identify the culture, practice and ethics of the                  10 press.                  11 A. I get that.                  12 MR JAY: To be absolutely clear, we are hearing from                  13 Mr McMullen as well.                  14 A. Good luck.                  15 Q. The position will be fully explored with him.                  16 A. Yes.                  17 Q. That's a helpful vignette into the case, the McMullen                  18 incident, but you also tell us about -- and I'm back to                  19 paragraph 27 of your witness statement. Earlier this                  20 year, officers from Operation Weeting came to see you --                  21 and we've heard two other witnesses today speak about                  22 the same sort of situation -- and they told you that                  23 your phone had been hacked. Could you just tell us                  24 a little bit about that, that meeting, please?                  25 A. Yes. They rang my lawyer -- the police rang my lawyer,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 wanted to show me some evidence. They came around and,                  2 as was one of the previous witnesses today explained,                  3 it's quite a formal thing. They get out these pages and                  4 they formally announce them, then they say, "Would you                  5 have a look at this page. Is there anything you                  6 recognise?" And I looked at it and saw various phone                  7 numbers of mine from the middle of the 2000 up to about                  8 2005, something like that, together with some PIN                  9 numbers, together with some access numbers. You know,                  10 you used to get a separate phone number to ring your                  11 messages remotely from another phone. And then there                  12 were other names I recognised on there. People around                  13 me, girlfriends, people I knew, numbers, words that all                  14 sort of made sense.</p> <p>15 In one particular case, it triggered a memory of                  16 a couple of stories that had been in the Daily Mirror                  17 and in the Daily Mail and I found that interesting. But                  18 when you see these pieces of paper in the police                  19 inquiry, they redact certain bits, including the famous                  20 top left-hand corner, which is where Mulcaire kept the                  21 initials of the particular journalist who had                  22 commissioned the phone hacking, and so subsequent to                  23 that interview with the police, I was very interested to                  24 know who had commissioned that particular page of                  25 hacking, seeing as it hadn't -- this particular story</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 judgment.                  2 First of all, can I ask you, please, to look at HG2,                  3 which will be behind your witness statement in this                  4 bundle, not as a separate tab. I'm not going to go into                  5 this in much detail unless you want me to. It relates                  6 to a front page of the News of the World. The greeting                  7 is "Happy Easter". It's 24 April of this year. It                  8 looks as if these are photographs taken with a telephoto                  9 lens; is that right?</p> <p>10 A. I would imagine so, yes. I was definitely unaware they                  11 were being taken. I wish I could find the piece of                  12 paper. Give me another clue where it's in. What's the                  13 tab number?</p> <p>14 Q. It's under tab 2. If you go through the first six or                  15 seven pages, you'll reach the end of your witness                  16 statement and then you should find the start of an                  17 exhibit, HG2, and the first three pages of the exhibit                  18 are the article we are referring to. Are you with me on                  19 that?</p> <p>20 A. Obviously, I'm being stupid. I'm on the second tab --</p> <p>21 Q. Third tab.</p> <p>22 A. It's the third tab?</p> <p>23 MR SHERBORNE: Can Mr Grant be handed a clean copy?</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: He can have my copy if there's any                  25 problem with it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 had not appeared in the News of the World but had                  2 appeared in the Daily Mail and the Daily Mirror.</p> <p>3 Q. Again, you mention the Daily Mail. You mentioned it for                  4 the first time because it's not in your witness                  5 statement.</p> <p>6 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>7 LORD LEVESON: 28.</p> <p>8 MR JAY: Yes, my apologies, you have.</p> <p>9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just for the avoidance of doubt, the                  10 top corner, which of course we're cyphering again for                  11 the reasons I've explained, that was in fact somebody                  12 who you linked to News of the World?</p> <p>13 A. To get access to the redacted top left-hand corner,                  14 I was told I had to ask for it formally through a court.                  15 I had to get a disclosure order from the Metropolitan                  16 Police, so I got it and it was in fact, or seemed to be,                  17 a journalist from the News of the World. So that is                  18 a mystery that he commissioned the work but it appeared                  19 in the Mail and the Mirror.</p> <p>20 MR JAY: A mystery we're not, I believe, going to be able to                  21 get to the bottom of today or possibly at all.</p> <p>22 May I move on, please, to your supplementary                  23 statement. This deals with quite recent events,                  24 culminating in the grant of an injunction last week by                  25 Mr Justice Tugendhat, and we've seen a copy of his</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 A. Thank you very much.</p> <p>2 MR JAY: Thank you, sir.</p> <p>3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Is it vertical(?) one underneath the                  4 statement?</p> <p>5 MR JAY: Yes.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So do you have it now?</p> <p>7 MR JAY: We're not concerned with the headline and we're not                  8 concerned with the detail, unless you want to discuss                  9 it. The real point is this is a telephoto lens,                  10 clearly, and you were unaware that these photographs                  11 were being taken?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. And you also say in your statement that you weren't                  14 asked to comment before the piece was published, along                  15 with the photographs?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Had you been asked to comment, what might you have said?</p> <p>18 A. I would have said nothing. There would have been no --                  19 I wouldn't have returned the calls. No one would have                  20 returned the calls.</p> <p>21 Q. Might you have taken proactive steps to protect your                  22 privacy, for example by taking legal proceedings?</p> <p>23 A. If I'd done that, it would have drawn attention to the                  24 whole story. My overwhelming motive throughout this                  25 whole episode was to protect the mother of my child from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 a press storm, so anything like what you've just 2 suggested would have been one way of alerting the media. 3 It would have been a matter of public record, and they 4 would have thought: "Oh, here's a good story", and her 5 life would have been made hell, as it subsequently was. 6 Q. Turning that on its head, by doing nothing, your life 7 and her life was made hell anyway, wasn't it? 8 A. Well, we held them off for a surprisingly long time. 9 After this article, they followed her around. She was 10 a single pregnant woman, she was being tailed by 11 paparazzi, one in particular who frightened her a lot, 12 over the months of her pregnancy, but they didn't have 13 anything to print that could link her to me until 14 I visited the hospital after the birth when, again, 15 there seems to have been a leak from the hospital. At 16 that point, the dam was breached and we were bombarded 17 with calls saying, "We know that this happened, that 18 Tinglan had a baby in the hospital and Hugh visited", 19 and they even knew the fake name she checked into the 20 hospital under. So clearly there had been a leak. 21 Then, again, my attitude was to say nothing, which 22 we did for a long time, and a lot of pressure was put 23 on, the typical pressure of the tabloids. In this case, 24 it was the Daily Mail who seemed to have all the 25 information, the details of the hospital and the fake Page 37</p>	<p>1 called my lawyer and we agreed to get the police onto 2 it, which we did, but at the last moment Tinglan, the 3 mother, probably rightly in retrospect, said, "Let's not 4 do that because there's always a chance of a leak from 5 the police and that will bring down the press storm on 6 my head", so we didn't. 7 Q. Taking that in stages, the contact was made with the 8 police. The police were willing to assist, were they 9 not? 10 A. Yes. They were. 11 Q. But then they were, as it were, called off because of 12 concern about leaks from the press to the police. 13 That's the sequence of events, isn't it? 14 A. From the police to the press. 15 Q. Police to the press. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. You touch on this or you deal with this in the final 18 sentence of paragraph 6 of your second statement. 19 A. Yeah. 20 Q. I'm going to ask you to try and exclude from your mind 21 supposition, speculation and opinion. Do you have any 22 direct evidence of leaks from the police to the press of 23 which you can give us evidence, Mr Grant? 24 A. I'm not quite sure where supposition blends into 25 evidence, but -- Page 39</p>
<p>1 name, et cetera. They kept saying, "We're going to 2 print this story anyway; what's your comment?" And 3 because I've got wise to this technique over the years, 4 it seemed to me that was a fishing technique and that 5 they didn't want to print the story based solely on 6 their hospital source because that might have been 7 unethical or possibly illegal, so they needed a comment 8 from my side and that is why I said nothing and I asked 9 all my various -- like my assistant in London and my PR 10 people in America, who didn't even know about this baby, 11 to say nothing as well. 12 Q. We're moving ahead a bit. There's some quite important 13 detail before we get to that stage. 14 A. Okay, I'm sorry. 15 Q. Particularly in paragraph 5 with your appearance on 16 Question Time in July. 17 A. Yeah. 18 Q. Then you tell us about the phone calls to -- 19 A. Tinglan. 20 Q. -- Ms Hong's phone number? 21 A. Yeah. 22 Q. And we see what you say about it. The man said, "Tell 23 Hugh Grant to shut the fuck up." 24 After that, were the police involved? 25 A. When she told me about the next day, I immediately Page 38</p>	<p>1 Q. What do you have direct knowledge of? Can we start with 2 that? 3 A. All I know is that for a number of years, although it 4 did get better in recent years, if someone like me 5 called the police for a burglary, a mugging, something 6 in the street, something that happened to me or my 7 girlfriend, the chances are that a photographer or 8 reporter would turn up on your doorstep before 9 a policeman. So whether you call that supposition or 10 fact, I don't know. 11 On top of that, I have, of course, also all Paul 12 McMullen's recorded testimony -- not testimony, but what 13 he said about paying the police, you know, a third of 14 the Metropolitan Police were on back-handers from the 15 tabloid press. 16 Q. I think there you're commenting on other people's 17 evidence. Can we try and confine it to your own 18 evidence? 19 A. Sure. It wasn't just me who experienced this phenomenon 20 of reporters or paparazzi coming around instead of 21 a policeman. Other people who had been in the public 22 eye who I used to have this conversation with complained 23 of exactly the same thing. 24 Q. Right. I think what I'm trying to do is trying to ask 25 you to give an example of something which might give Page 40</p>

<p>1 rise to the inference that there was a leak from the                  2 police to the press, a particular example from your own                  3 experience, not you commenting on someone else's                  4 experience.                  5 A. Well --                  6 Q. Do you see my point?                  7 A. Yeah. I'm trying to think of a specific one.                  8 I certainly remember my one girlfriend being mugged and                  9 we called the police and it was photographers who came                  10 around first.                  11 Q. Okay. Thank you.                  12 Going back to your second witness statement, you                  13 visited the hospital, I think, the day after the child's                  14 birth?                  15 A. Yes.                  16 Q. I think, if you don't mind me giving the date so it fits                  17 into the chronology, it's the end of September, isn't                  18 it?                  19 A. Yes.                  20 Q. And what happened after that visit in terms of press                  21 interest?                  22 A. Well, I had been very reluctant to be present at the                  23 birth because of the danger of a leak from the hospital                  24 bringing this press storm down on the mother of my child                  25 and what was about to be my child.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 A. They threatened to, but because we didn't comment, they                  2 didn't, and so it was broken by an American magazine.                  3 Q. You say they threatened to, but another way of looking                  4 at this is that until they had a comment from you                  5 confirming the truth of the story, they quite rightly                  6 decided not to publish. Would that be fair?                  7 A. That would be wrong. It doesn't say it in these emails,                  8 but you could bring in my assistant or my publicity                  9 people in New York, who started to get the calls as                  10 well, and on these phone calls it was consistently: "We                  11 are publishing this story tomorrow", which is a tactic                  12 of brinkmanship to make you say something so they can                  13 stand up a story which would otherwise have to stand up                  14 entirely on a piece of leaked information from                  15 a hospital.                  16 Q. Whatever they were saying to you in order to try to get                  17 you to confirm or deny the story, it is an incontestable                  18 fact they didn't publish the story, did they?                  19 A. They did not, no.                  20 Q. And it's a fair inference, isn't it, that the reason                  21 that they didn't publish the story was that you hadn't                  22 confirmed its truth?                  23 A. I disagree with your interpretation. I think the reason                  24 they didn't publish it was because they would not have                  25 looked good to have published it merely on leaked</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 Q. Yes.                  2 A. So I had actually made a plan with the mother not to                  3 visit at all, but to visit when she got home from                  4 hospital a few days later. She was very happy with that                  5 plan, she had her parents there, she had my cousin                  6 there, my female cousin. But actually, on the day after                  7 the birth, I couldn't resist a quick visit. I thought:                  8 "I am going to try and get away with this." I went,                  9 I had a look, it was very nice, but the day after that                  10 I think it was, the phone calls started from the                  11 Daily Mail in this case, saying, "We know about Tinglan                  12 having had this baby, we know about Hugh having visited,                  13 we know what name she checked in under, we're going to                  14 write this story." So all my fears about the leak                  15 seemed to have been justified.                  16 Q. The evidence you provide to the Inquiry in relation to                  17 that -- this, again, is in the exhibit HG2, which I hope                  18 you're going to be able to find in that bundle, or we                  19 can provide it to you separately. There are examples of                  20 emails and texts dated 21 October, which is three weeks                  21 and a bit after the birth.                  22 A. Yes. Thank you.                  23 Q. To be clear about this, the Daily Mail did not publish                  24 a story, did they, until the news had been broken by                  25 someone else? That's right, isn't it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 information from a hospital, which is unethical.                  2 Q. But they might have obtained the information from                  3 somewhere else altogether, mightn't they?                  4 A. It's possible, but so highly unlikely that I find it                  5 incredible.                  6 Q. Was there interest from other newspapers at this time?                  7 A. There was the Daily Star, I think, were onto it in some                  8 way, yeah. But originally the whole story had been the                  9 subject of a -- back in the days of the pregnancy, had                  10 been the subject of News of the World interest, one                  11 journalist in particular. When the News of the World                  12 was closed down, that journalist appears to have moved                  13 over to the Daily Mail, because a lot of this work,                  14 these calls, come from that same journalist, now                  15 representing the Daily Mail.                  16 Q. That's right. There's no evidence that that journalist,                  17 though, took any photographs with him from the                  18 News of the World to the Daily Mail, is there?                  19 A. The photographs subsequently published in the Daily Mail                  20 when they did publish a story about my baby, some of                  21 those came from -- are identical to the pictures used                  22 earlier by the News of the World, so whether he took the                  23 pictures himself or one of his photographers took the                  24 pictures, they are the same pictures that the                  25 News of the World used, long lens surveillance shots,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 that the Daily Mail subsequently published more 2 recently.</p> <p>3 Q. Right. But those pictures could have been purchased 4 from the same paparazzo -- that's the singular of the 5 noun -- who had provided the photographs to the 6 News of the World originally, couldn't they?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, they could.</p> <p>8 Q. I'm going to deal, slightly out of sequence, before 9 going back, with the incident which culminated in 10 injunction proceedings in front of Mr Justice Tugendhat. 11 You cover this in paragraph 20 of your supplementary 12 statement.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Potentially it was a very dangerous incident, because 15 the grandmother of the child had to jump out of the way 16 of the car in which was one or more of these individuals 17 with the cameras; that's correct, isn't it?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. The house where the mother of my child and my 19 child were besieged was surrounded by these paparazzi, 20 and I asked my lawyer what could possibly be done. He 21 said maybe if they get some pictures of some of these 22 people, we could have a chance, ask them to be called 23 off. So the mother -- the 61-year-old grandmother of my 24 child went out into the street, took a picture of a man 25 sitting in a car with a great big camera. He turned</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 bunch of them outside, and seeing as this was an 2 egregious event, likely to warrant an injunction against 3 all of these people, that seems like the right tactic 4 that he adopted.</p> <p>5 Q. Yes. No one's questioning the tactic or the strategy.</p> <p>6 A. Okay.</p> <p>7 Q. And we know what has happened and we've read the reasons 8 of Mr Justice Tugendhat in a publicly available 9 judgment.</p> <p>10 A. Okay.</p> <p>11 Q. But as a little coda to these serious matters, your 12 publicist put out a statement about the birth.</p> <p>13 A. In the end.</p> <p>14 Q. Is that right?</p> <p>15 A. Yeah, in the end, having held off all that time from all 16 these inquiries and this brinkmanship from the British 17 papers, a magazine in America, US magazine, seemed to 18 have got hold of the story and they published, at which 19 point I was in a sort of no-win situation. I, in the 20 end, decided the best thing to do -- because the story 21 within hours was going to go everywhere, particularly 22 into the British tabloids and I was very anxious that 23 they would give it a twisted spin, so I thought the best 24 thing to do would be to be as honest about the thing as 25 possible, so I said I was delighted with the birth but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 around, took a lot of pictures of her, wound the window 2 down, shouted a lot of abuse at her, and then as she 3 crossed the door, he menaced her with his car, drove at 4 her very fast, made her jump out of the way, and then at 5 the end of the road, he did a u-turn and came back and 6 menaced her again with the car.</p> <p>7 Q. I think the police were also involved, were they not?</p> <p>8 A. The police have been called and they are coming to see 9 Tinglan on Wednesday about this.</p> <p>10 Q. Oh, right. At the time, my understanding is that the 11 police offered to go around and to get a statement or 12 investigate the matter with the mother and the 13 grandmother. Do you know about that?</p> <p>14 A. I think -- I can't remember. I think we may have 15 thought about that. I can't remember the exact facts, 16 but certainly the police should be involved in this.</p> <p>17 Q. Yes. But the police did want to become involved, and 18 they were told -- and there's no suggestion that this is 19 improper -- they were told by your solicitor you'd 20 prefer in the first instance to get an injunction. Is 21 that possible?</p> <p>22 A. Well, that may be true that my solicitor said that, and 23 he may well have been in the right in that a police 24 investigation would have taken some time. It might have 25 in the end put one bad pap away, but there were a whole</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 I did not want the papers to write a twisted version 2 which suggested that Tinglan was a jilted girlfriend, so 3 I tried to find a form of words to say that she was 4 a friend but had not been a formal girlfriend and that 5 therefore there was no question of her having been 6 jilted as a pregnant mother.</p> <p>7 Q. Was it your form of words or your publicist's form of 8 words?</p> <p>9 A. We had a hasty conversation on the phone while I was 10 filming in Germany. It was not ideal circumstances. 11 I was dressed as a cannibal at the time.</p> <p>12 Q. Maybe you were, but the form of words which were 13 alighted upon were these:</p> <p>14 "I can confirm --"</p> <p>15 This is your publicist speaking on your behalf?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. "... Hugh Grant is the delighted father of a baby girl." 18 So far so good, as it were.</p> <p>19 "He and the mother had a fleeting affair and while 20 this was not planned, Hugh could not be happier or more 21 supportive."</p> <p>22 A. Mm.</p> <p>23 Q. Putting it bluntly, weren't you leading with the chin 24 a bit, perhaps, with that form of words?</p> <p>25 A. Well, as I just said to you, I felt it was important to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 be honest and not to have a wrong version, a twisted                  2 version appear in the papers which was that she was my                  3 girlfriend who had been dumped when she got pregnant,                  4 which was simply not the case, or that it was a planned                  5 pregnancy that I then ran away from. So I was                  6 protecting her reputation as a -- I didn't want her to                  7 appear to be a jilted girlfriend. I was protecting                  8 mine -- I didn't want it to seem that I was a monster                  9 who ran away from my girlfriend. It's true I've been                  10 given a hard time for using those words because -- which                  11 is ironic, seeing as it's actually the truth, but that                  12 doesn't seem to be very popular.</p> <p>13 Q. Well, one alternative strategy might have been simply to                  14 confirm the birth of the child and that you're                  15 a delighted father, but otherwise words to the effect:                  16 "This is a private matter and neither the mother nor the                  17 father wish to comment further."</p> <p>18 A. Yes, which would have been an invitation to the papers                  19 to write something invented about the relationship that                  20 I had with that girl. In the absence of information,                  21 they'll make it up.</p> <p>22 Q. You see, what did happen in response to the form of                  23 words you selected -- you alight in one piece in the                  24 Daily Mail by Amanda Platell, which is written in                  25 a particular tone or house style, but other newspapers</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 been a really good father, I wouldn't have visited at                  2 all, seeing as it brought down a press storm on the                  3 mother's head.</p> <p>4 Q. I'll just finish this little sequence of evidence before                  5 we'll break, but in terms of your privacy, is it your                  6 position that that these matters should not have been                  7 covered at all in the press or is it your position that                  8 they should have been covered in a certain way, in a way                  9 which didn't misrepresent?</p> <p>10 A. Well, if you cling to the naive notion that newspapers                  11 are there to report the truth, nothing could really be                  12 wrong with that. I mean, I had a baby with this girl.                  13 She's a good friend of mine, she still is a good friend.                  14 It's a nice thing. There's really not much more to it                  15 than that, but that doesn't sell newspapers, so a nasty                  16 spin has to be given to it, hence the extraordinary                  17 efforts of various newspapers to dig dirt on the new                  18 mother happily enjoying her new baby while the                  19 Daily Mail paid £125,000 to her ex-lover to sell private                  20 pictures of her.</p> <p>21 Q. I think your complaint is it's not the intrusion into                  22 your privacy per se; it is the nasty spin they put on                  23 a story which, had they reported in a fairer and more                  24 accurate way, would have been a proper story for them to                  25 print. Is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 have put in similar pieces, as you're aware. Giles                  2 Coren in the Times saying words to the effect that you                  3 should marry the woman, there's some even in the                  4 Guardian, which isn't altogether complimentary, and                  5 something in the Daily Telegraph. It could be said all                  6 organs of the press are intruding into your privacy, but                  7 the theme from each of them is not inconsistent. Do you                  8 know what I mean?</p> <p>9 A. First of all -- well, first of all, there were some                  10 supportive pieces as well, especially in the broad                  11 sheets, that said that -- you know, gave me some credit                  12 for having put my hand up and said, "This is my baby and                  13 I'm delighted with it", and providing for the child and                  14 the mother. The hatchet jobs -- that's fine; I expect                  15 hatchet jobs. That's been the story of the last 17                  16 years. But it always does make you grind your teeth                  17 slightly when they're based on falsities and                  18 misreporting and a lot of those hatchet jobs were based,                  19 for instance, on the fact that I now had a 21-year-old                  20 German girlfriend, whereas in fact I don't. That was an                  21 invented girlfriend, invented by a German tabloid and                  22 then copied out faithfully by British hacks and it was                  23 also based on -- the hatchet jobs were based on the fact                  24 that I'd appeared to only visit for half an hour                  25 callously the day after the birth, when in fact if I'd</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 A. No, it's both. There are moments here which are                  2 intrusions into privacy. I think that if you have paid                  3 off someone at the Portland Hospital to tell you about                  4 a celebrity's baby, that's an invasion of privacy, for                  5 instance. But there's also ugly spin being put on a lot                  6 of this stuff because it sells papers better, and in the                  7 opinion of some people, the particularly ugly spin in                  8 the last few weeks given to the birth of my baby was not                  9 unrelated to the fact that I'm here today giving                  10 evidence at this Inquiry, and it's referenced in some of                  11 those hatchet jobs, including by Amanda Platell. She                  12 gives my concern about abuses of tabloid press as                  13 a particular reason why I should be loathed. So it is                  14 possible for some people to see a connection between                  15 those hatchet jobs and what I'm saying here and have                  16 said for the last few months.</p> <p>17 Q. Yes, the bit that you throw in about paying off someone                  18 at the Portland Hospital, that is, I must say or must                  19 suggest, just a piece of speculation on your part. You                  20 don't know that that's how the story broke at all, do                  21 you?</p> <p>22 A. Unless my cousin rang up the Daily Mail and told them,                  23 or the Chinese parents who speak no English did that,                  24 it's very hard to draw any other conclusion.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you know how the American paper or magazine got hold</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 of the story?</p> <p>2 A. No.</p> <p>3 MR JAY: Sir, this may be a convenient moment to break.</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. We'll have a break and</p> <p>5 you can have a break, too, but let me just ask this:</p> <p>6 you've been granted relief by Mr Justice Tugendhat; has</p> <p>7 that grant of relief been reflected in your child and</p> <p>8 mother being left alone?</p> <p>9 A. Yes. Very grateful for it.</p> <p>10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You'll be conscious that I've made it</p> <p>11 clear that I would want to know if intrusion arose as</p> <p>12 a result of anybody giving evidence to this Inquiry.</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I heard that and I'm grateful for that, too.</p> <p>14 MR SHERBORNE: Sir, before you rise, can I deal with two</p> <p>15 very brief matters of chronology?</p> <p>16 The first was raised in relation to the 1996 Daily</p> <p>17 Mirror article that Mr Grant refers to in paragraph 13</p> <p>18 of his witness statement. Sir, you asked that it might</p> <p>19 be possible that we would have the dates. Can I just</p> <p>20 give you those dates, because we've managed to obtain</p> <p>21 them.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes.</p> <p>23 MR SHERBORNE: As I understand it, the visit to the hospital</p> <p>24 was in May 1996, 29 May.</p> <p>25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. That -- yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, and this chronology actually</p> <p>2 comes out of Mr Justice Tugendhat's judgment?</p> <p>3 MR SHERBORNE: It does, sir.</p> <p>4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Which we have.</p> <p>5 MR SHERBORNE: We do.</p> <p>6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. We'll have ten</p> <p>7 minutes or as long as Mr Grant needs.</p> <p>8 (3.17 pm)</p> <p>9 (A short break)</p> <p>10 (3.25 pm)</p> <p>11 MR JAY: Mr Grant, I have been asked to clarify one matter</p> <p>12 we covered earlier this afternoon. It's in your first</p> <p>13 witness statement and it's in paragraph 28, please.</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. You refer to a detailed expose story written by both the</p> <p>16 Mirror and the Mail. I won't ask you for details of the</p> <p>17 story as such, but can you help us with details as to</p> <p>18 the approximate date?</p> <p>19 A. Yeah, summer 2004.</p> <p>20 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>21 Go back to the issue of press misreporting and</p> <p>22 particularly in the context of your supplementary</p> <p>23 statement. You refer in that statement to two articles</p> <p>24 in the Sun, don't you?</p> <p>25 A. Do I? What do I say?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 MR SHERBORNE: The article which appeared in the Sunday</p> <p>2 Mirror was on 23 June of 1996. The adjudication was not</p> <p>3 until 27 July of 1997. So Mr Grant in his recollection</p> <p>4 perhaps was being somewhat generous. It took over</p> <p>5 a year for that adjudication to arise.</p> <p>6 As I understand it, a legal claim was issued</p> <p>7 in October of 1997, which resulted somewhat more</p> <p>8 speedily in the judgment that he refers to in</p> <p>9 paragraph 14 being given in his favour in December, only</p> <p>10 some two months later.</p> <p>11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. Thank you.</p> <p>12 MR SHERBORNE: Then can I move on secondly to the</p> <p>13 injunction. Mr Jay referred to the report to the police</p> <p>14 and the decision to follow a civil course instead, or at</p> <p>15 least in the first instance. Can I just remind you,</p> <p>16 sir, that the incident relating to the paparazzo who was</p> <p>17 trying to run over Mr Grant's baby's grandmother took</p> <p>18 place on Thursday, 10 November, and I applied the next</p> <p>19 day for an emergency injunction on Friday, 11 November,</p> <p>20 which was granted by Mr Justice Tugendhat, although his</p> <p>21 reasons arrived a week later. The purpose, of course,</p> <p>22 was to immediately bring the campaign to an end, which,</p> <p>23 as you've just heard, it did, with remarkable</p> <p>24 efficiency.</p> <p>25 That's all I wanted to say, sir.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Let's look at it. What paragraph is</p> <p>2 it?</p> <p>3 MR JAY: Paragraph 17, towards the bottom of that paragraph.</p> <p>4 A. Yeah.</p> <p>5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: This is the second statement?</p> <p>6 MR JAY: It is, yes, pardon me.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.</p> <p>8 MR JAY: I don't really want to go over too much of the</p> <p>9 detail of this unless you're content that I do so.</p> <p>10 You've seen, I think, the article in the Sun on</p> <p>11 3 November. That's been provided to you today, hasn't</p> <p>12 it?</p> <p>13 A. Mm.</p> <p>14 Q. First of all, it shows a picture. It says that you're</p> <p>15 holding hands with someone but if one looks closely at</p> <p>16 the photograph -- I'm not giving expert evidence here --</p> <p>17 it doesn't in fact look as if you are holding hands.</p> <p>18 A. Correct; you can see the palm of her hand.</p> <p>19 Q. Yes. Is the woman in the photograph, as it were,</p> <p>20 correctly depicted?</p> <p>21 A. Again, I -- I'm useless with this folder. I can't --</p> <p>22 Q. We provided it to you separately.</p> <p>23 MR SHERBORNE: Can I hand up my copy?</p> <p>24 MR JAY: Yes.</p> <p>25 MR SHERBORNE: I don't think Mr Grant has this. (Handed)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 MR JAY: No.</p> <p>2 A. So, there's three girls in this article, three pictures</p> <p>3 of three girls.</p> <p>4 Q. Yes. We're looking at the one at the bottom of the</p> <p>5 page.</p> <p>6 A. Sorry, two girls.</p> <p>7 Q. Yes.</p> <p>8 A. Yes. Is that --</p> <p>9 Q. It's the same girl?</p> <p>10 A. That is the same girl.</p> <p>11 Q. Yes. Because to be clear, the article on the following</p> <p>12 day, 4 November, is some different young woman</p> <p>13 altogether?</p> <p>14 A. That's right. On the following day, the Sun published</p> <p>15 this article saying, "Hugh a new girl three weeks before</p> <p>16 baby", and there's a picture of me and a girl, who is</p> <p>17 not the same girl. In fact, I have no idea who she is.</p> <p>18 One of the reasons why they're unable to find any</p> <p>19 pictures of me and my new German girlfriend is because</p> <p>20 I don't have one. So they have had to find a picture of</p> <p>21 just me and some girl.</p> <p>22 Q. To be fair to the article -- I'm just looking at what it</p> <p>23 says and not any inferences or innuendo which might be</p> <p>24 drawn from it -- this woman is not described as your</p> <p>25 girlfriend, is she?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 the article.</p> <p>2 Q. But then it does add in the middle a local report, which</p> <p>3 is the report from the German magazine, Bild?</p> <p>4 A. Correct, which said there had been -- after this dinner,</p> <p>5 this innocent dinner I'd had with this German girl --</p> <p>6 not this one but the one pictured on the page before.</p> <p>7 I'd had a completely innocent dinner, dropped her off in</p> <p>8 a taxi, and because the paparazzi had got a rather</p> <p>9 boring shot of a man getting into a taxi with a girl,</p> <p>10 woman, either he or his agency or Bild invented</p> <p>11 passionate kissing in the taxi, because there</p> <p>12 emphatically was none. And yes, I do know I'm under</p> <p>13 oath here. This is tittle-tattle. I only went on about</p> <p>14 it in my supplementary statement because it was</p> <p>15 a particular stick used to beat me round the head with</p> <p>16 during the birth of my daughter, and, some people think,</p> <p>17 because I'm here giving evidence to the Leveson Inquiry.</p> <p>18 So they look for any stick they can find and -- oh yeah,</p> <p>19 much too young girlfriend, even though she doesn't</p> <p>20 exist, and even though she had twice denied that she was</p> <p>21 my girlfriend. It wasn't just in the Sun. It was in</p> <p>22 many, many papers.</p> <p>23 Q. I'm not putting a point of view. I'm just seeking to</p> <p>24 analyse what appears in this article and receive your</p> <p>25 comment upon it, and you've kindly given me that. Okay.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 A. What, you want me to read the whole thing now?</p> <p>2 Q. I think you've had the chance to look at it. Maybe</p> <p>3 you'll trust me. She's not described as your</p> <p>4 girlfriend, is she?</p> <p>5 MR SHERBORNE: I don't think Mr Grant has had a chance to</p> <p>6 look at that. He hasn't seen that before.</p> <p>7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm sorry about that. Then he ought</p> <p>8 to have the chance to read it.</p> <p>9 MR JAY: Yes.</p> <p>10 A. Well, I don't know. To me, the headline, "Hugh a new</p> <p>11 girl three weeks before baby" suggests girlfriend, but</p> <p>12 maybe I'm reading a different language.</p> <p>13 MR JAY: Mm. okay. I'm just trying to be fair to the</p> <p>14 authors of this piece, Mr Grant. It's for others to</p> <p>15 make a judgment about it.</p> <p>16 A. You've been very, very fair to News International and to</p> <p>17 Associated today.</p> <p>18 Q. I hope I've been fair to everybody.</p> <p>19 A. You told me back stage you were going to bowl me</p> <p>20 straight balls, but if these are straight balls, I'd</p> <p>21 hate to see your googlies.</p> <p>22 Q. Let me continue to bowl you straight balls. It also</p> <p>23 reports the woman's denial that this is other than</p> <p>24 a friendship, doesn't it?</p> <p>25 A. It does. Right down at the bottom line at the end of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could I just ask you: what's the</p> <p>2 position of the papers in Germany? Have they reported</p> <p>3 you in the way in which you've complained about being --</p> <p>4 A. Yes, yes, yes, and it wouldn't just be in Germany now.</p> <p>5 It's everywhere. I say in my main statement, you know,</p> <p>6 this is one of the problems, that if something's</p> <p>7 misreported, it just splatters all around the Internet</p> <p>8 instantly. So this is now fact that I have a new</p> <p>9 21-year-old German girlfriend all round the world.</p> <p>10 Well, so what? It doesn't really matter that much</p> <p>11 except when it's used, you know, as a stick to beat me</p> <p>12 with again and again, and then it does become a little</p> <p>13 wearying, and you sort of wish that they'd bothered to</p> <p>14 either ask me or that they'd bothered to listen to the</p> <p>15 girl's two denials.</p> <p>16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Is it possible to do something about</p> <p>17 this in Germany?</p> <p>18 A. Well, really, it's not a big -- it's not like it's</p> <p>19 libellous. I was merely giving an example of the use of</p> <p>20 lazy reporting and misreporting to beat someone up</p> <p>21 a bit, if there was an agenda for beating someone up.</p> <p>22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand your point.</p> <p>23 A. If the girl had been 12, I would have sued.</p> <p>24 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand the point entirely, but</p> <p>25 I'm trying to understand what I can put a box around in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

1 this country, whether by way of recommendation or  
 2 otherwise, and what impact that might have elsewhere in  
 3 the world to somebody who isn't merely a national figure  
 4 but has international status. Do you see the point --  
 5 A. I think so.  
 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- I'm grappling with, that I've --  
 7 A. If the story emanates from abroad, as this one did, your  
 8 recommendation, whatever it might be, would have to be,  
 9 you know, that you at least have to check the facts or  
 10 perhaps -- I mean, it is hard for me to believe we're  
 11 going to quarrel for hours over a piece of  
 12 tittle-tattle. It doesn't really matter that much.  
 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm not concerned about this  
 14 particular article in terms.  
 15 A. I know.  
 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Indeed, as you probably know, this  
 17 part of this Inquiry isn't about who precisely did what  
 18 at what circumstance to whom. I'm trying to look at  
 19 a bigger picture.  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And the bigger picture is not merely  
 22 the whole question of regulation of the press in this  
 23 country and their culture and practices, but also how  
 24 that is impacted or affected by what happens abroad or  
 25 what happens on the Internet. You heard the question

Page 61

1 I asked this morning.  
 2 A. Mm.  
 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So I'm just trying to bet a bigger  
 4 picture.  
 5 A. All I can say is when it comes to stories being copied  
 6 around the world, they are copied from the Internet, and  
 7 they're particularly copied if they come from a website  
 8 that belongs to a newspaper because newspapers are  
 9 generally considered to have a certain gravitas and to  
 10 have been -- the news-gathering techniques to have  
 11 a certain professionalism, albeit often that may be  
 12 a mistaken assumption. But that is why -- you know, if  
 13 a story is in a -- on a newspaper website, it will  
 14 scatter much faster than if it's just on someone's blog  
 15 or it's a tweet or something like that. I can sense  
 16 I haven't answered your question.  
 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, my question is really aimed at  
 18 the impact that I can have on other press activity in  
 19 relation to somebody with an international reputation  
 20 simply by doing what I can do in this country.  
 21 A. There's obviously nothing you can do outside this  
 22 country.  
 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I agree.  
 24 A. But if you made our press behave more professionally,  
 25 then stories that they write would not be so damaging

Page 62

1 when they spread around the Internet.  
 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I see that. Then the question arises  
 3 where stories emanate from. One of the stories you  
 4 talked about actually I think you said emanated  
 5 initially in America, but whether it went to America  
 6 from here or where, I don't know.  
 7 A. That is always difficult to know.  
 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. I'm just trying to grapple with  
 9 the whole problem; that's all. I'm certainly not  
 10 focusing on individual stories.  
 11 A. Yes.  
 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: For the reasons that you understand  
 13 A. Yes, yes.  
 14 MR JAY: Okay, Mr Grant, we'll move off the Sun in your  
 15 second witness statement. I'm going to cover now some  
 16 matters of opinion to try and look at the bigger  
 17 picture.  
 18 Before I do that, can I ask you some questions about  
 19 publicity and publicists?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. You've referred now at least once to a publicist you  
 22 have in the US. Is that right?  
 23 A. Yeah.  
 24 Q. How many publicists do you have around the world?  
 25 A. Well, I have one. They're in New York, and I only use

Page 63

1 them sporadically when a film is coming out, and they're  
 2 not for -- they're like anti-publicists. They're for  
 3 not getting publicity but for fending off -- a studio  
 4 may have a film coming out. The studio -- say Warner  
 5 Brothers -- will be desperate for you to do everything,  
 6 particularly in America, and the job of my publicist --  
 7 I pay them not very much money -- is to say, "No, he's  
 8 not doing that, he's not doing that. He might do that  
 9 because that's a classy one." That's all they're there  
 10 for. Between films I don't pay them, they go on hiatus  
 11 and they knew nothing about this until they kept getting  
 12 calls from British tabloids saying, "We've heard he's had  
 13 a baby."  
 14 Q. It's not their function to advise you in relation to  
 15 your dealings with the press?  
 16 A. It is in relation to my dealings with the press in  
 17 America when a film comes out and a little bit around  
 18 the world, although they try to be experts on what TV  
 19 show is a good one to do if you're on a world tour in  
 20 Russia, but obviously they're not massive experts on  
 21 that, and to be absolutely honest, they throw up their  
 22 hands when it comes to Britain. They say, "We have no  
 23 advice. It's uncontrollable."  
 24 Q. Yes, okay. We did see, I think, in relation to that  
 25 little piece in the Sun about your health, that your

Page 64

<p>1 publicist declined to comment.                  2 A. They called my assistant --                  3 Q. Just wait for the question, please.                  4 A. Yes.                  5 Q. It looks as if, rightly or wrongly, someone at the Sun                  6 telephoned your assistant or your publicist for comment                  7 and quite rightly got no comment. Is that a fair                  8 inference?                  9 A. Yes, they will either have phoned the publicist in                  10 America, which is unlikely, or they phoned my assistant                  11 in London --                  12 MR JAY: Right.                  13 A. -- who is an executive assistant. She's fantastic, but                  14 she's not a publicist, but they may have given her that                  15 label.                  16 Q. Okay, I understand. So it's a standard PA?                  17 A. Right.                  18 Q. It's not really part of her role to advise you in                  19 relation to your dealings with the press?                  20 A. Not at all. In terms of the British press, I have no                  21 advice except myself.                  22 Q. Right. So if, for example, you give an interview to the                  23 press, you consult your own advice and no one else's; is                  24 that correct?                  25 A. You're talking about the British press?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 Q. No, of course not. Yes. Then you continue:                  2 "When I think about actors I know, I'd much rather                  3 hear about who they're shagging than what film they're                  4 doing next."                  5 A. That remains true. But again, as I say, it doesn't mean                  6 to say that information should be obtained illegally.                  7 Q. No, fair point, and then you go on probably into an area                  8 which it's unnecessary for me to --                  9 A. I know that it was given -- that quote, I think, comes                  10 from a press conference with a thing called the                  11 Hollywood Foreign Press Association, the people who                  12 control the Golden Globes. It's always a very                  13 light-hearted occasion and always try to give                  14 light-hearted answers and as I say in my main statement,                  15 prior to about a year ago, if the subject of the British                  16 tabloids came up in an interview, I took the line that                  17 just about everyone else in the country who's ever been                  18 in the crosshairs of the British tabloids will take,                  19 which is to give either a neutral answer or a flippant                  20 answer --                  21 Q. Yes.                  22 A. -- because to speak out and criticise is to invite                  23 a terrible press storm on your head and hatchet jobs,                  24 et cetera.                  25 Q. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 Q. Yes.                  2 A. Well, in 17 years I've only given two interviews to the                  3 British press. The rest have all been either bought in                  4 from abroad or patch and pasted together or invented,                  5 and so the question doesn't really arise.                  6 Q. Yes. You gave one interview, I think, in 2002, which                  7 has been drawn to my attention. So that you have your                  8 bearings, it relates to about the time you were doing                  9 a film with Sandra Bullock. Do you remember that?                  10 A. Yes.                  11 Q. I can't remember the name of the film now.                  12 A. "Two Weeks' Notice"?                  13 Q. Yes. The question you got was:                  14 "How frustrating is it for you that people are more                  15 interested in your love life than your films?"                  16 And your answer, probably quite accurately, was:                  17 "I do get frustrated but I do understand where                  18 the -- where the interest comes from."                  19 A. Mm-hm.                  20 Q. It's pretty obvious, isn't it, where the interest comes                  21 from?                  22 A. Yeah, of course people are interested in people's love                  23 lives. We all have that natural curiosity or prurience.                  24 It doesn't mean to at that say that you can obtain that                  25 information illegally.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 A. So I think the answer that you're referring to there,                  2 the Hollywood Foreign presentation, was one of those                  3 flippant answers.                  4 Q. Yes. I assumed it was, Mr Grant. That's why I wasn't                  5 going to read it out.                  6 You quite rightly say that whatever the interest of                  7 the public may be in your private life, that cannot                  8 justify the use of illegal or probably, you would add,                  9 unethical news-gathering methods.                  10 A. Right.                  11 Q. Is that correct? What happens, though, if information                  12 has eventually entered the public domain and then once                  13 it's in the public domain, the press want to comment on                  14 it? Is it fair and right for them to do that, in your                  15 view?                  16 A. I think not. I've always thought if they've obtained                  17 the information illegally or unethically, why should                  18 I help them with their story? After all, their motive                  19 in the first place was money, profit. It's almost never                  20 public interest. It's profit. Someone's making money                  21 out of this so why should I help them make money out of                  22 invading my privacy?                  23 Q. Probably it's my fault for not asking the question not                  24 with ultimate precision. We see it a little bit in                  25 microcosm in relation to the recent history, that for</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 whatever reason the Daily Mail don't publish. You've 2 made your point in relation to how the Daily Mail, you 3 think, obtained relevant information, but they didn't 4 act on it. Eventually it comes out in the United States 5 of America. We don't know on what basis they obtained 6 the information for their story, but once it's out in 7 the public domain, it's now in the public domain, and so 8 everyone else -- by which I mean other organs of the 9 press -- can now comment, can't they, on the story which 10 is now, by definition, in the public domain? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Would you agree with that? 13 A. That's right, and from experience, I know that not only 14 will they comment but they'll write it as news with 15 a little embellishments. For instance, they will say 16 "a friend tells us", or "an insider tells us", or 17 "an associate tells us". And those are usually 18 invented. They almost never exist. So they'll create 19 a whole new story based on the original story which 20 could have a very wrong or twisted slant to it. Hence 21 my decision to put out a statement to try and give the 22 real facts. 23 Q. You've added a sort of extra dimension, quite rightly, 24 that we've got a story which is now in the public 25 domain. Okay? It's unclear, particularly if it's in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 of embellishment which is incorrect and ways that that 2 can be corrected or addressed. Of course one way it can 3 be corrected is that you can bring proceedings of 4 defamation. 5 A. Yeah, if it's -- if my lawyer thinks it's defamatory, 6 yeah. 7 Q. What about complaining to the PCC in relation to recent 8 events? Have you thought about doing that? 9 A. My experience, as you saw way back in 1996, was not 10 a positive one with the PCC. They took a year to decide 11 that it was a wrongful thing for a hospital to give out 12 my medical records. So I didn't have massive faith in 13 them since then, and in the case of recent events, my 14 lawyer did -- before he took out the injunction, while 15 we were trying to work out a strategy to get rid of all 16 these paparazzi and reporters who were besieging the 17 mother of my child's house and making her life miserable 18 and following her -- he did send a warning letter to the 19 newspapers and he sent it via the PCC, and there was 20 a 10 per cent dip in activity outside the house for 21 maybe 12 hours, and then it was back to normal. So my 22 verdict on their contribution to this was that they were 23 ineffectual. 24 Q. Okay. Another factor in your case, which I suppose adds 25 to the --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 the States, how the American magazine or newspaper 2 obtained the story. We simply don't know. 3 A. Yeah. 4 Q. Once it's in the public domain there, it's in the public 5 domain across the world and now the press here comment 6 upon it. Your point is: well, what they're certainly 7 not allowed to do is embellish the story, add bits of 8 news which are untrue. Okay, let's agree with that. 9 A. Mm-hm. 10 Q. But if they stop short of doing that and they don't 11 embellish, but all they do is comment on you, maybe in 12 a way you don't like -- 13 A. No, that's not -- 14 Q. -- do you have a problem with that? 15 A. No, I don't mind -- listen, I'm ready for comments. 16 Believe me, I am very ready for that. I've experienced 17 a lot of it. As I said earlier, I just do slightly 18 gnash my teeth when those hatchet jobs are based on 19 wrong facts or lazy journalism, like the 21-year-old 20 girlfriend or like: "It was cruel of him to only visit 21 for half an hour" when in fact I was being kind. 22 I mean, I was trying to protect the mother of my child. 23 That's annoying. But of course everyone's entitled to 24 their opinion. 25 Q. Yes. Obviously the Inquiry needs to consider this issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Sorry, Mr Jay, let me just consider 2 that for a moment. 3 The PCC at the moment is monitoring or provides 4 a service to certain of the press but that won't ever 5 touch paparazzi. 6 A. The freelance paparazzi? 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The freelance paparazzi. 8 A. Right. 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So one of the things that one would 10 have to think about is whether one could devise a system 11 that bites irrespective of whether you're employed by 12 a newspaper. 13 A. Yes. You're probably right. Or to somehow kill the 14 market for those pictures. I think, you know, there 15 would be no rogue paparazzi if there wasn't big national 16 papers paying for their pictures, and so I'm not quite 17 sure which end of that you attack first. 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, the question then arises, which 19 goes back to the question I was asking just a moment 20 ago, about international interest, because one could 21 say -- one could do something about paying for pictures 22 in this country but one wouldn't be able to regulate the 23 sale of pictures abroad. 24 A. That is true. That is true. But I think, if I'm right, 25 in France there's various laws -- for instance, you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 can't take someone's picture in a public place, and that                  2 does give a much more humane, civilised existence to                  3 people in the public eye despite the fact that                  4 presumably those pictures could come back in from                  5 abroad. Is that what you were saying?                  6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, there are various problems.                  7 One can think about the domestic market, which is what                  8 I'm mainly, obviously, focusing on, but I have in you                  9 somebody who has the international perspective because                  10 of the interest that's been shown in you                  11 internationally.                  12 A. Yes, yes.                  13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm just wondering how that plays                  14 into the picture.                  15 A. I don't know the answer to your question, I'm afraid, in                  16 terms of international. All I can tell you is that not                  17 just in my opinion, but in the opinion of other people                  18 who are quite well-known around the world and who, for                  19 instance, sometimes do tours, publicity tours for a film                  20 or whatever, they're unanimous in saying that by far and                  21 away the worst territory to do any kind of publicity in                  22 is this one.                  23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It may be that's right and maybe                  24 therefore I just shouldn't worry about anywhere else.                  25 I'm just looking for your assistance; that's all.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay.                  2 A. The visit to the baby and all that kind of -- didn't                  3 know the facts, and it is possible that as many of my                  4 friends, professors of journalism who have rang me up                  5 and said it's clearly a deliberate hatchet job because                  6 you're speaking against the tabloid press -- that may be                  7 true, but I was reluctant even to talk about it in this                  8 statement because I've always felt that comment is                  9 comment and it's not really cool to comment on it. But                  10 I was persuaded that because of this theory that it                  11 might be a stick to beat me with because I'm doing this,                  12 that maybe it was relevant.                  13 Q. Yes. I've put in the equation three other articles                  14 which are admittedly not couched in quite the same                  15 language but which make the same sort of critical point                  16 about you.                  17 A. Mm-hm.                  18 Q. So we're weighing up quite a lot of material of                  19 a similar nature. Maybe you hadn't seen all of those.                  20 A. I haven't seen all of them, thank God, but I'm sure, as                  21 I said earlier -- you keep coming back to this point --                  22 they are based largely on a lot of misreporting.                  23 Q. Yes.                  24 A. But for the parts that are not based on misreporting, it                  25 is perfectly fine to hate me. I have become very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 A. I think that's right. There are certain pockets of                  2 quite toxic yellow journalism around the rest of the                  3 world, but on the whole, it's still done with a certain                  4 elegance, an elegance that we've lost in the last 30                  5 years in this country.                  6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.                  7 MR JAY: Quite a lot of what you have said is directed to                  8 the Daily Mail. Can I ask you this, though: whether in                  9 the context of the Amanda Platell article or more                  10 generally, if one strips away the factual inaccuracies,                  11 particularly in relation to the German woman -- and                  12 you've clearly made your point about that -- do you have                  13 any other broad objection to her piece, notwithstanding                  14 that it is true to say it's very critical of you? On                  15 a human level, of course the answer is: "Of course I do,                  16 I don't like to read that sort of stuff."                  17 A. Yeah.                  18 Q. But I'm asking you to think more abstractly in terms of                  19 where the boundaries should be drawn in terms of                  20 regulating these pieces. Because after all, all she is                  21 doing is exercising her right to comment.                  22 A. Right. Well, that's fine.                  23 Q. That's fine, is it?                  24 A. Yeah, it's fine. It's sad that it's based on so much                  25 lazy reporting, you know.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 accustomed to that. It's been extremely fashionable for                  2 a long time and that is what I expect in this country.                  3 Q. Okay. Mr Grant, we probably have another half an hour.                  4 I'm going to give you the opportunity now, as I have                  5 given previous witnesses, to, as it were, elaborate your                  6 opinion. Your opinion is contained mainly in your first                  7 statement, beginning at paragraph 39 and 40.                  8 A. Yes. This is where I go through my ten myths.                  9 Q. Your ten myths. What I'd like to do with you is make                  10 sure that we've got your points, okay, and that we're                  11 not skating over them.                  12 A. Yes.                  13 Q. And that we have them in mind. Your first point is one                  14 I think we'd probably all agree with, that it isn't only                  15 celebrities and politicians who suffer at the hands of                  16 popular papers. You've given us quite a few examples                  17 there, and indeed some of the examples you've given are                  18 human beings who will testify before this Inquiry very                  19 shortly.                  20 A. Yeah, I talk about particularly vulnerable people who                  21 have been victims of trauma, such as the Dowlers who we                  22 saw earlier today, or the victims of the London bombings                  23 or families of soldiers killed in Afghanistan. Then                  24 I talk about collateral damage.                  25 Q. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 A. Where, say, my phone is hacked but so is my assistant's,                  2 my -- you know, my brother's or my father's, whatever it                  3 might be. Innocent people having their privacy invaded                  4 just because they're in the -- it's collateral damage.                  5 And then I talk about innocent people who have been                  6 monstered by the press, like Christopher Jefferies or                  7 Robert Murat or Madeleine McCann, who the press have                  8 implied very heavily are guilty of heinous crimes when                  9 in fact they're entirely innocent.                  10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You didn't mean Madeleine; you meant                  11 her parents?                  12 A. I'm sorry, yes.                  13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, and I only corrected                  14 not to get at you but because I don't want anybody to                  15 think that you said that.                  16 A. Yes, well, I did and I was wrong.                  17 MR JAY: Then you deal, myth two, with the issue of whether                  18 egregious abuses of privacy were confined to the                  19 News of the World and you express your opinion about                  20 that. Of course, here you're hitting one of the central                  21 points of this Inquiry. This is what we're trying to                  22 investigate. We're looking at all the evidence and                  23 we've heard your position on all of that.                  24 A. Yes.                  25 Q. And you've given us direct evidence in relation to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 some of the best in the world in this country -- out of                  2 the bath and let the bath water run out.                  3 Everyone says it's a very difficult distinction to                  4 make, what's good journalism and what's not, and                  5 although I don't say it's black and white, there's                  6 a grey area, I think it's a lot less grey than people                  7 make it out to be.                  8 Q. Thank you. Your fifth myth is a related point, which is                  9 that over-regulation will lead to tyranny. Can I ask                  10 you, please, though about what your positive proposals                  11 would be in relation to press regulation?                  12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not compulsory for you --                  13 A. Sorry, say that again? You're actually on myth four,                  14 I think:                  15 "Any attempt to regulate the press means we're                  16 heading for Zimbabwe."                  17 Which is another of these arguments like "don't                  18 throw the baby out with the bath water" that we often                  19 hear, and I simply make the point that (a) that is way                  20 too simplistic and (b) very often insincere. It's very                  21 often used by tabloid newspapers to protect their                  22 lucrative business model, which is, after all, almost no                  23 journalism now -- it's mainly the appropriation, usually                  24 through illegal means, of British citizens' fundamental                  25 rights of privacy to sell them for profit -- and that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 Mr McMullen and obviously everything he says will be                  2 taken fully into account.                  3 A. Yes, and I'd just like to echo what I heard from one of                  4 the earlier witnesses, that given the                  5 cross-fertilisation of journalists in the tabloid world,                  6 it's highly unlikely that they only practise dark arts                  7 for one title. They were always swapping titles and                  8 I can't believe that they didn't practise those arts in                  9 other places as well.                  10 Q. Your third myth is the risking throwing the baby out                  11 with the bath water point. Could you elaborate on that                  12 one, please, in your own words? What are you getting at                  13 there?                  14 A. Well, it is a commonly voiced opinion that you cannot in                  15 any way regulate or improve or legislate or -- for the                  16 worst practices of the worst of journalists in this                  17 country without damaging free speech, without muzzling                  18 proper journalism, and the metaphor that's endlessly                  19 bandied about is: be careful of throwing the baby out                  20 with the bath water. I've always said that I don't                  21 think it is that difficult to tell the difference                  22 between what is bath water and what is a baby. To most                  23 people, it's bloody obvious, and that I have always                  24 thought that you just simply take the baby -- which in                  25 this case is excellent journalism; we're lucky to have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 this argument that you can't in any way deal with that                  2 without us living in a state like Zimbabwe is not only                  3 absurd but it's also highly convenient for them. There                  4 are, of course, many gradations of regulation between                  5 Zimbabwe and between being the total free-for-all that                  6 we have now.                  7 Q. Yes. I think this Inquiry, if you're able to assist to                  8 this extent, is concerned with the gradations                  9 particularly in the middle of this spectrum. No one is                  10 suggesting, I hope, anything close to a form of                  11 regulation which will lead to Zimbabwe or tyranny.                  12 We're concerned with something much less extensive than                  13 that.                  14 A. You are, yes.                  15 Q. But can you help us, please, with some positive                  16 suggestions? It's an invitation. You don't have to                  17 take it up.                  18 A. There are forms of -- if you take at one end of the                  19 scale state regulation, and you take at the other end of                  20 the scale no -- well, self-regulation, there are various                  21 gradations in between, including what some might call                  22 co-regulation, which would be regulation by -- say                  23 a panel that both be comprised of partly journalists but                  24 partly also non-journalists, experts in the field,                  25 professors of journalism, who would draw up a Code of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 Ethics and would apply it with proper sanctions,                  2 meaningful sanctions, either financial or in terms of                  3 apologies, but which would need -- and this is where it                  4 gets interesting. To have any teeth and to be                  5 meaningful, it would have to have, right at the back, as                  6 a backstop, some kind of regulation. Otherwise it would                  7 be easy, for instance, for the Express Group, as they                  8 have done now, to walk-away from the PCC, and say,                  9 "We're not having any of that", or you could set up                  10 a new regulator who would find some appalling abuse by                  11 a paper and say, "You're fined £200,000", and they say,                  12 "We're not paying." Somewhere there has to be a little                  13 bit of statute right at the back to make it more                  14 meaningful. But there are people much more expert on                  15 this than me, and I'm sure you'll be calling them.                  16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You're absolutely right that we'll be                  17 calling a range of people with ideas, but certainly from                  18 my perspective it's abundantly clear this is a topic                  19 that you've thought about carefully. You've obviously                  20 suffered as you've described and had the experiences                  21 you've described, whether justifiably or not, and                  22 therefore I wanted to make sure that you had the                  23 opportunity to say anything you wanted to say on the                  24 subject.                  25 A. Well, I mean I come to that sort of at the end of my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 in the case of many -- the vast majority of these                  2 injunction cases, does the newspaper in question not                  3 even bother to turn up to defend their piece on the                  4 grounds of public interest? The judge sits there and                  5 says, "Well, where's the paper?" and the paper doesn't                  6 turn up, and I ask: is that because there is no public                  7 interest defence? And I think we all know the answer to                  8 that.                  9 And I make the point that ultimately it all comes                  10 down to public interest and who is better to decide                  11 whether a piece of journalism is in the public interest                  12 or not? Would that be a judge or would it be the                  13 tabloid editor who stands to profit commercially from                  14 the piece? To me, it's the judge, and I would argue                  15 that most of the judgments made in these injunction                  16 cases have been right, and nor versus they been biased.                  17 We saw that in the Rio Ferdinand case recently. The                  18 judges are quite ready to rule the other way, whether                  19 rightly or wrongly, wrongly in my opinion in that case,                  20 but they're quite ready to go either way, and that all                  21 this fuss from at least the tabloid end of the British                  22 press about these injunctions is bogus and convenient.                  23 Q. Thank you. This leads into the sixth myth, which is                  24 a related point --                  25 A. Yes, I just mentioned that.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 statement, yes, that is when I say that I think there                  2 are midways that could make everyone happy.                  3 The press is, after all, the only industry in this                  4 country that has a profound influence over other people,                  5 over our citizens, that is regulated only by itself.                  6 There's no other industry like that, whether it's                  7 medicine or advertising, it's all regulated, and no one                  8 calls for those regulators to be tougher than our press,                  9 and yet when it comes to themselves: no regulation,                  10 "we'll do it ourselves"; which, although a lovely idea,                  11 which would be fantastic if it had worked, has                  12 absolutely been shown not to have worked for the last 20                  13 or 30 years. You know, we've had so many last chance                  14 saloons and it's been a failure, and this is the big                  15 opportunity now, this Inquiry, in my opinion.                  16 MR JAY: Thank you. The fifth myth: current privacy law                  17 under the Human Rights Act muzzles the press. You make                  18 the point a breach of privacy case has never been taken                  19 against the Guardian, to your knowledge.                  20 A. Yes. There's a lot of squealing, again from the tabloid                  21 press, about these injunctions and so on and they say it                  22 muzzles the press and it has a chilling effect,                  23 et cetera, and I just make the point, well, first of                  24 all, no one's taken a privacy case against the Guardian;                  25 and secondly, if there's a public interest defence, why</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 Q. -- (overspeaking) there you say they don't. You've                  2 expressed a view about the Rio Ferdinand case and we'll                  3 see what happens to that. Permission to appeal has been                  4 refused by the single lord justice, but we understand                  5 the application is being renewed.                  6 Myth number 7: privacy can only ever be a rich man's                  7 toy. That depends a bit on the survival of conditional                  8 fee agreements, doesn't it?                  9 A. I think it depends on that and on establishing a proper                  10 regulator.                  11 Q. Yes.                  12 A. If you establish a meaningful regulator, if you have                  13 your privacy abused or you're libelled, you should be                  14 able to go straight to the regulator and skip the whole                  15 court process, especially if you're not a person of                  16 means, it's a wonderful thing to be able to go to, and                  17 I think that would be the most wonderful thing to come                  18 out of this Inquiry, if there was a proper regulator                  19 that gave access to justice of that kind without having                  20 to go through the courts. But there will always be                  21 cases when people will have to go through the courts,                  22 and when they do, it is scandalous, in my opinion, that                  23 this will now be -- if what is going through Parliament                  24 now on the back of the Jackson Report happens, people                  25 without great means will be excluded from justice.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 If you look at the Dowlers, used a CFA to -- if                  2 their phone hacking case against the News of the World.                  3 They would not have been able to make that case, they                  4 would not have been able to prosecute that case without                  5 a CFA. Chris Jefferies, the man wrongly accused of that                  6 murder down in Bristol, wrongly maligned by the press,                  7 had to use a CFA to get justice. Sara Payne, same                  8 thing.                  9 Without CFAs, those people have no justice, and this                  10 whole campaign to restrict the use of CFAs has been very                  11 heavily pushed by the tabloid press, and the government,                  12 in its infinite obedience to the tabloid press, has                  13 simply said, "Yes, fine."                  14 Q. Okay, thank you. That's very clear on that point,                  15 Mr Grant. The eighth point: most sex exposes (exposes,                  16 I think that should be) carry a public interest defence.                  17 I think you've already made your position clear on that,                  18 but --                  19 A. I -- I.                  20 Q. -- please say whatever you wish to say in addition.                  21 A. I say that there are certainly cases where there is                  22 a public interest defence. If you're a politician who                  23 campaigns on a family values platform, then it's                  24 definitely a public interest to have his -- and he's                  25 being -- you know, having an extramarital affair or he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 Faustian pact idea, isn't it?                  2 A. Yes, it's another very common defence of what I would                  3 call the privacy invasion industry; some people would                  4 call it at tabloid press. What I say is the myth is                  5 that people like me want to be in the papers, and need                  6 them, and therefore our objections to privacy intrusions                  7 are hypocritical.                  8 Then I go on to, at some length, explain how that is                  9 a myth that in my business -- for instance, what I need                  10 is not to be in the Sun or the Daily Mail or the Mirror;                  11 it's to make enjoyable films. That is 85 per cent of                  12 success. About 10 per cent of success is that the film                  13 is then well marketed. You know, if someone cuts a good                  14 trailer or a good TV spot.                  15 Then right at the end, about 5 per cent of the                  16 success might be that just before the film comes out you                  17 bang the drum a bit and do a bit of publicity. So it's                  18 quite minor and you are under an obligation to do it,                  19 not just -- sometimes it's contractual, but more often                  20 it's just a moral obligation. Someone put up a lot of                  21 money for the film, hundreds of people, sometimes                  22 thousands, have worked on this thing for over a year.                  23 If you didn't do a little bit of publicity, you'd be                  24 about monster, you'd be a bit of a diva, people would                  25 hate you, so you have to do a little bit. But it's only</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 likes to dress up as a nun and sleep with prostitutes,                  2 we need to know about it because he's a hypocrite. But                  3 I think that the vast majority of these exposes of                  4 people's sex life are not in the public interest and the                  5 public interest defences as offered by tabloid                  6 newspapers are very flimsy at best. They'll say, oh                  7 well, you know, Ryan Giggs trades on his reputation, but                  8 he doesn't, he trades -- to me, quite clearly, on the                  9 fact that he's a brilliant footballer and I don't                  10 believe that anyone is buying a pair of Ryan Giggs                  11 football boots because they think that he's a great                  12 family man. I think they're buying it because he's won                  13 lots of trophies for Manchester United.                  14 Funnily enough, I read in the Independent this                  15 morning that apparently I do the same thing, I trade on                  16 my good name, and therefore there's a public interest                  17 defence in going into my private life, but I wasn't                  18 aware I traded on my good name. I've never had a good                  19 name. And it's made absolutely no difference at all.                  20 I'm the man who was arrested with a prostitute and the                  21 film still made tons of money. It doesn't -- it doesn't                  22 matter.                  23 Q. Okay. I think that's very clear, Mr Grant.                  24 A. Okay.                  25 Q. Myth number nine: this is the sort of development of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 5 per cent of what contributes to the success of a film,                  2 and within that 5 per cent, how much of that is tabloid                  3 newspapers or even newspapers at all? Very little.                  4 What everyone does now is they favour broadcast media.                  5 You reach many more people faster, you can't be                  6 misquoted, so everyone is doing television and radio.                  7 If tabloids were so important to the success of                  8 a film or the success of an actor or the success of                  9 a singer, why is it that, for instance, none of us in                  10 the large ensemble cast of "Love Actually" talked to any                  11 tabloid newspaper at all when the film was released and                  12 the film was still gigantic. The theory put about by                  13 the tabloid papers, that they are responsible for the                  14 success of films and they create stars, is entirely                  15 spurious. It's either their mad arrogance, because they                  16 live in this funny cocoon of self-importance, or it's                  17 highly convenient because it gives them a chance to the                  18 say, "If anyone criticises us, it's hypocritical."                  19 Q. Particularly if one goes back towards the start of your                  20 successful part of your career in the early 1990s,                  21 didn't it help your career that you were quite                  22 constantly in the public eye?                  23 A. No.                  24 Q. Didn't that make you more attractive to future                  25 filmmakers, possibly?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 A. No. That is another --</p> <p>2 Q. Why do you say that?</p> <p>3 A. I would argue that's another myth put about by tabloids.</p> <p>4 What made me attractive to other the filmmakers was that</p> <p>5 "Four Weddings and a Funeral" made gazillions at the box</p> <p>6 office. That's all they care about. After all, a</p> <p>7 couple of films later, as I say, I was arrested with</p> <p>8 a prostitute, got a lot of -- you couldn't call it</p> <p>9 positive press, and I was still very hireable because the</p> <p>10 films made money. That's all that, in terms of a</p> <p>11 career, that the studios cared about, and audiences only</p> <p>12 care about whether the film is entertaining or not.</p> <p>13 I could show you examples of films that is have</p> <p>14 wall-to-wall tabloid coverage before they come out and</p> <p>15 still die at the box office because they're not</p> <p>16 entertaining. It's a big myth.</p> <p>17 I personally have actually argued with my lawyer</p> <p>18 over the years when making settlements, libel or</p> <p>19 whatever, with papers, saying, "Please, forget money,</p> <p>20 forget an apology, just make them give an undertaking</p> <p>21 never to mention my name again", and I could bring you</p> <p>22 a list of hundreds of people in the public eye in this</p> <p>23 country who would happily sign up for that. It's such</p> <p>24 a myth to say oh, we want it so badly, we're so vain,</p> <p>25 we're dying to be in the papers. It's the last thing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 the British press, but when anyone does do an interview,</p> <p>2 it is, after all, a bargain. The press of that paper</p> <p>3 gets a boost in sales, they hope, and the person who's</p> <p>4 giving the interview gets a bit of noise about their</p> <p>5 forthcoming project. And like any barter, when it's</p> <p>6 over, it's over. If I sell you a pint of milk for 50p,</p> <p>7 I would not expect you to come to me forever afterwards,</p> <p>8 saying, "You slut, you sold me milk once. I can now</p> <p>9 help myself to your milk forever." I would think you</p> <p>10 were mad.</p> <p>11 Q. I think your point is more specifically that having</p> <p>12 conducted this little contract, it certainly doesn't</p> <p>13 authorise the press subsequently to investigate you in</p> <p>14 an unlawful or unethical way or intrude into your</p> <p>15 privacy?</p> <p>16 A. That is what I'm saying. Yes, exactly that. I do</p> <p>17 believe that enshrined in our bill of rights, you know,</p> <p>18 article 8 is a person's basic expectation of a right to</p> <p>19 privacy, and I don't think that you should have to give</p> <p>20 that up just because you once gave an interview about</p> <p>21 a film to the Daily Mirror.</p> <p>22 Q. Yes. Then the tenth myth is the lovable rogue point.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Which you say they clearly are not.</p> <p>25 A. Well, you know, you see them glamourising themselves as,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 anybody wants, to be in a British tabloid paper,</p> <p>2 unnecessary, so long as the work you were doing at that</p> <p>3 moment is okay.</p> <p>4 Q. You deal with, I suppose, one aspect or the last aspect</p> <p>5 of the Faustian pact point in paragraphs 81 to 82 of</p> <p>6 your statement.</p> <p>7 A. Yeah.</p> <p>8 Q. What is the consideration, if one uses a legal term, if</p> <p>9 you do an interview with a newspaper or magazine?</p> <p>10 You're saying here, well, it doesn't give a lifelong</p> <p>11 licence to publish whatever you like about the subject</p> <p>12 matter of the interview?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. That, of course, must be right as a matter of common</p> <p>15 sense, but it surely gives some licence to comment,</p> <p>16 possibly unfavourably, on the subject matter of the</p> <p>17 interview?</p> <p>18 A. Yeah, of course, that would be fine. Absolutely fine.</p> <p>19 But I'm talking here about intrusion, and I have heard</p> <p>20 the defence quite frequently from tabloid papers: "Oh,</p> <p>21 well, you know, if you have ever talked about your</p> <p>22 private life, then you have no defence, you have no</p> <p>23 right to an expectation of privacy", which I think is</p> <p>24 absurd. Because anyone -- I mean, as I told you</p> <p>25 earlier, I think I've only done two interviews ever with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 you know: "We might be a bit naughty but we get the</p> <p>2 story", but when the story has been obtained by hacking</p> <p>3 the phone of a murdered school girl or of the family of</p> <p>4 a soldier killed in Afghanistan, I don't find that</p> <p>5 lovable and naughty. I found that cowardly and bullying</p> <p>6 and shocking, and most shocking is that this has been</p> <p>7 allowed to go on for so long with no one putting their</p> <p>8 hand up and saying, "Stop." Not the police, because</p> <p>9 they're intimidated, not our MPs, because they've been</p> <p>10 intimidated, and not our government, because they've</p> <p>11 been intimidated.</p> <p>12 Q. Your positive proposals for the future you've touched on</p> <p>13 already and they're encapsulated, are they not, in</p> <p>14 paragraph 88 of your statement?</p> <p>15 A. Yes. We sort of went over them. I give you -- well,</p> <p>16 paragraph 86, in a nutshell, it seems clear to me that</p> <p>17 it should be unacceptable and illegal to deprive</p> <p>18 a person of their fundamental human right to privacy</p> <p>19 unless there is a real public interest defence. It's</p> <p>20 not rocket science and the ways I would protect it are</p> <p>21 (1) I would resist the clamour of the privacy-stealing</p> <p>22 industry to close down our privacy law as it's emerged</p> <p>23 through common law, through the Human Rights Act, and</p> <p>24 I would disband the PCC and create a proper regulator</p> <p>25 with teeth, which would not only protect people from</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 abuses of privacy or libel as a first port of call, but                  2 it would also be there to protect good journalism. You                  3 know, this is the other side of all this. I'm, for                  4 instance, keen on libel reform. I'm keen to see good                  5 journalism protected as much as one possibly can. I'm                  6 the reverse of a muzzler. But I personally feel that                  7 the licence that the tabloid press has had to steal                  8 British citizens' privacy for their commercial profit --                  9 very often vulnerable British citizens -- is a scandal                  10 that weak governments for too long have allowed to pass.                  11 MR JAY: Mr Grant, is there anything else you wish to tell                  12 the Inquiry? We've covered the ground --                  13 A. No. I mean, it's a strange form of interview, in                  14 the sense that I wish I'd been able to read my two                  15 statements out loud first, because, you know, we haven't                  16 really -- it's all been me defending positions in them                  17 without anyone knowing what the statement actually says.                  18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think you'll find the statements                  19 will be available.                  20 A. Yeah, well, I hope people read it.                  21 MR JAY: They will, Mr Grant, and also all the points, I'd                  22 like to think, that you wanted to bring out, you have                  23 brought out, but if you feel there's a point that --                  24 A. There is one final point.                  25 Q. Okay, please bring it out.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And although you may have felt that                  2 you were on a back foot too often, it was a way of                  3 getting the picture across so that everybody has had the                  4 chance, through Mr Jay, to ask questions, but the thrust                  5 of your evidence contained within your statements is                  6 clear and you have no need to doubt that I've read it or                  7 not paid full attention to it and won't continue to pay                  8 full attention to it.                  9 A. Well, thank you very much. Thank you.                  10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right, thank you. Anything else?                  11 MR CAPLAN: Just the issue of anonymity, if I may.                  12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Let Mr Grant return to where he comes                  13 from so that he can just relax for a moment. Right,                  14 yes.                  15 Discussion                  16 MR CAPLAN: Only this: that you made a ruling on 9 November.                  17 If anybody was thinking of exercising their rights under                  18 section 38 of the Act to seek any review of that ruling,                  19 the time obviously expires on Wednesday. Since then, of                  20 course, there has been a draft anonymity protocol.                  21 I think you invited any further submissions to be with                  22 you by last Thursday at 5 o'clock. We've certainly put                  23 in some submissions. I was just raising the matter to                  24 see if you wished to confirm the protocol or add                  25 anything during the course of tomorrow before the time</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 A. Because I'm tired, I wouldn't mind reading it, actually,                  2 seeing as it's in my statement. It's my conclusion.                  3 I just say:                  4 "I don't want to see the end of popular print                  5 journalism. I wouldn't want a country that was fawning                  6 to power or success. I like and admire and would always                  7 want to protect the British instinct to be sceptical,                  8 irreverent, difficult and to take the piss and that                  9 a free press is, of course, the cornerstone of                  10 democracy."                  11 There's no question about that. I just think that                  12 there has been a section of our press that has become --                  13 allowed to become toxic over the last 20 or 30 years,                  14 its main tactic being bullying and intimidation and                  15 blackmail. I think that that needs a lot of courage to                  16 stand up to and I feel that it's time -- you know, this                  17 country has had historically a good record standing up                  18 to bullies, and I think it's time that this country                  19 found the courage to stand up to this bully now.                  20 MR JAY: Thank you very much.                  21 A. Okay.                  22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Grant, thank you very much. I'm                  23 conscious that a lot of effort went into making the                  24 statements you made.                  25 A. Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 limit expires.                  2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm happy to do that. I think that                  3 essentially many of the points to be made I take on                  4 board. I'm happy to clarify some things if they need                  5 clarifying -- I'm not entirely sure they do -- but I'd                  6 be surprised if anything in the protocol could impact on                  7 the fundamental decision that I made in my ruling. But                  8 if there's anything that needs to be done tomorrow, I'll                  9 do it.                  10 I think there are two slightly separate issues.                  11 There's the anonymity that I've granted to one of                  12 Mr Sherborne's clients, who I know as HJK, and there are                  13 some knock-on consequences as to how we're going to deal                  14 with his evidence. In the absence of anybody saying                  15 anything to the contrary, I propose to maintain that                  16 anonymity and to allow him to give evidence in a way                  17 that ensures it.                  18 That will require taking certain measures. For                  19 example, he's likely to give evidence in a cleared                  20 Inquiry room. Obviously the core participants' lawyers                  21 will be present, but otherwise, nobody. I'm likely not                  22 to have the running transcript but to publish                  23 a transcript as soon thereafter as possible, in case                  24 something emerges that needs to be redacted. In that                  25 way, I hope that his evidence will be put into the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 public domain but in a form that doesn't damage the                  2 anonymity that he has sought and which I have found to                  3 be justifiable.                  4 If anybody has any comment about that --                  5 I appreciate you've only just recently seen the                  6 suggestions in that regard -- I'd be very, very                  7 interested to hear them. As regards other people, I'll                  8 make sure that I have a final protocol for you to look                  9 at tomorrow, but as I say, I don't think it should                  10 really make a difference to whether or not there is an                  11 issue that's worthy of ventilation in the Divisional                  12 Court, which of course is your decision entirely.                  13 MR CAPLAN: Thank you.                  14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Jay?                  15 MR JAY: Just a couple of points. First, we just received                  16 submissions from the Metropolitan Police in relation to                  17 the anonymity protocol just this afternoon, so those                  18 will have to be considered for obvious reasons.                  19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. Now that's come out, I'll say                  20 the reason there hasn't been one is because it was only                  21 up to literally the end of Friday that I saw the last                  22 one. I wasn't sure we'd got them all -- and indeed, now                  23 you've heard that I hadn't got them all -- and I didn't                  24 want to finalise anything until we'd heard from anybody.                  25 That's what I say in my own defence, which I wasn't</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1                  2 I N D E X                  3                  4 Housekeeping .....10                  5                  6 MR BOB DOWLER AND MRS SALLY DOWLER .....15                  7 (sworn)                  8 Questions from MR JAY .....15                  9 Questions from MR SHERBORNE .....16                  10 Questions from MR JAY .....20                  11 MS JOAN ALISON SMITH (affirmed) .....35                  12 Questions from MRS PATRY HOSKINS .....35                  13 Questions from LORD JUSTICE LEVESON .....56                  14 MR GRAHAM JULIAN SHEAR (sworn) .....58                  15 Questions from MR JAY .....58                  16 Questions from LORD JUSTICE LEVESON .....98                  17 MR HUGH JOHN MUNGO GRANT (affirmed) .....108                  18 Questions from by MR JAY .....108                  19 Discussion .....203                  20                  21                  22                  23                  24                  25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 going to say anything about.                  2 Right, anything else, Mr Jay?                  3 MR JAY: In relation to HJK, there's one issue which need be                  4 touched on, whether when he gives his evidence he will                  5 not give evidence in relation to any named newspaper.                  6 In other words, that will be redacted out of his                  7 evidence.                  8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes. I've made it clear, I think, if                  9 not in a ruling then certainly in argument, that in                  10 relation to any anonymous witness, in order to protect                  11 the position of any of the media, it would be quite                  12 wrong to allow names or titles to be identified. I'm                  13 not going to make decisions about names and titles. As                  14 everybody knows, I'm looking at custom and practices and                  15 ethics across the piece, which is why my questions to                  16 Mr Grant were of general rather than specific topics.                  17 I would adopt the same process for HJK, so if that's                  18 a matter of concern to anybody, then they should say so.                  19 Thank you. Well, thank you very much indeed.                  20 I repeat my thanks, as I will to all the witnesses,                  21 particularly those who have come, as all have today,                  22 voluntarily. Thank you very much.                  23 (4.28 pm)                  24 (The hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock the following day)                  25</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	

A				B		
<b>able</b> 13:8 26:19 34:20 42:18 72:22 80:7 84:14,16 85:3 85:4 93:14	<b>admittedly</b> 75:14	95:20 96:11,16 97:2,17	20:21 86:20 89:7	<b>b</b> 79:20	83:10	<b>bounty</b> 18:21
<b>abroad</b> 61:7,24 66:4 72:23 73:5	<b>adopt</b> 98:17	<b>anonymous</b> 98:10	<b>arrived</b> 54:21	<b>baby</b> 14:19,20 17:7 18:12 37:18 38:10 42:12 44:20 48:17 50:12 51:12,18 52:4 52:8 57:16 58:11 64:13 75:2 78:10,19 78:22,24 79:18	<b>beyond</b> 32:8 <b>biased</b> 83:16 <b>big</b> 2:23 45:25 60:18 72:15 82:14 89:16 <b>bigger</b> 61:19,21 62:3 63:16 <b>biggest</b> 28:10,24 <b>Bild</b> 59:3,10 <b>bill</b> 91:17 <b>birth</b> 37:14 41:14,23 42:7 42:21 47:12,25 49:14 50:25 52:8 59:16 <b>bit</b> 3:7 17:14 30:3 32:24 38:12 42:21 48:24 52:17 60:21 64:17 68:24 81:13 84:7 87:17,17 87:23,24,25 91:4 92:1	<b>box</b> 25:6 60:25 89:5,15 <b>breach</b> 11:3 14:18,21 22:16 82:18 <b>breached</b> 37:16 <b>breaches</b> 22:21 <b>break</b> 2:6 4:9 22:14 51:5 53:3,4,5 55:9 <b>breaking</b> 28:14 <b>break-in</b> 4:23 5:23 <b>breath</b> 14:25 <b>brief</b> 3:10 53:15 <b>brilliant</b> 86:9 <b>bring</b> 39:5 43:8 54:22 71:3 89:21 93:22,25 <b>bringing</b> 22:22 41:24 <b>brinkmanship</b> 43:12 47:16
<b>absence</b> 49:20 96:14	<b>affirmed</b> 1:4 99:9,15	<b>answered</b> 62:16	<b>articles</b> 15:24 55:23 75:13	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bites</b> 72:11 <b>bits</b> 26:4,5,16 30:7 31:23 32:2 33:19 70:7 <b>bit's</b> 16:17 <b>bizarre</b> 8:4,9 <b>black</b> 79:5 <b>blackmail</b> 94:15 <b>blagging</b> 23:2 <b>blends</b> 39:24 <b>blip</b> 3:16 <b>blog</b> 62:14 <b>bloody</b> 78:23 <b>blue</b> 20:11 <b>Bluetooth</b> 20:7 <b>blunt</b> 29:17 <b>bluntly</b> 48:23 <b>board</b> 96:4 <b>boasting</b> 25:9 <b>BOB</b> 99:4 <b>bogus</b> 83:22 <b>bombarded</b> 37:16 <b>bombings</b> 76:22 <b>book</b> 5:21 <b>boost</b> 91:3 <b>boots</b> 86:11 <b>boring</b> 7:14 26:4 26:16 59:9 <b>bother</b> 83:3 <b>bothered</b> 60:13 60:14 <b>bottom</b> 10:3 12:1 13:23 17:12 26:9 34:21 56:3 57:4 58:25 <b>bought</b> 18:5 30:8 66:3 <b>boundaries</b> 74:19	<b>break</b> 2:6 4:9 22:14 51:5 53:3,4,5 55:9 <b>breaking</b> 28:14 <b>break-in</b> 4:23 5:23 <b>breath</b> 14:25 <b>brief</b> 3:10 53:15 <b>brilliant</b> 86:9 <b>bring</b> 39:5 43:8 54:22 71:3 89:21 93:22,25 <b>bringing</b> 22:22 41:24 <b>brinkmanship</b> 43:12 47:16 <b>Bristol</b> 85:6 <b>Britain</b> 64:22 <b>British</b> 3:15 4:14 5:16 16:1,4 21:7 47:16,22 50:22 64:12 65:20,25 66:3 67:15,18 79:24 83:21 90:1 91:1 93:8,9 94:7 <b>broad</b> 50:10 74:13 <b>broadcast</b> 88:4 <b>broke</b> 24:10 52:20 <b>broken</b> 5:10 6:7 30:8 42:24 43:2 <b>Brothers</b> 8:4,11 8:15 64:5 <b>brother's</b> 77:2 <b>brought</b> 51:2 93:23 <b>bullies</b> 94:18 <b>Bullock</b> 66:9 <b>bully</b> 94:19 <b>bullying</b> 92:5 94:14 <b>bunch</b> 47:1 <b>bundle</b> 1:8 11:15 25:21 35:4 42:18 <b>burglar</b> 5:19 6:5 6:10,17 <b>burglary</b> 40:5 <b>burgled</b> 6:18 <b>business</b> 79:22 87:9 <b>buy</b> 19:6 30:1,12 <b>buying</b> 86:10,12
<b>absolutely</b> 28:9 28:23 29:15 30:15 32:12 64:21 81:16 82:12 86:19 90:18	<b>Afghanistan</b> 76:23 92:4	<b>answers</b> 30:13 67:14 68:3	<b>arts</b> 78:6,8	<b>baby's</b> 54:17	<b>backstop</b> 81:6	<b>back-handers</b> 40:14
<b>absurd</b> 80:3 90:24	<b>agenda</b> 60:21	<b>anybody</b> 31:19 53:12 77:14 90:1 95:17 96:14 97:4,24 98:18	<b>asked</b> 23:14 26:7 27:5 36:14,17 38:8 45:20 53:18 55:11 62:1	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bad</b> 6:5 46:25	<b>badly</b> 17:21 89:24
<b>abundantly</b> 81:18	<b>age-old</b> 16:25	<b>apologies</b> 34:8 81:3	<b>asking</b> 23:17 27:25 29:4 68:23 72:19 74:18	<b>badly</b> 17:21 89:24	<b>badly</b> 17:21 89:24	<b>balls</b> 58:20,20,22
<b>abuse</b> 46:2 81:10	<b>ago</b> 67:15 72:20	<b>apologise</b> 10:14	<b>ask</b> 23:17 27:25 29:4 68:23 72:19 74:18	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>abused</b> 17:22 84:13	<b>agree</b> 13:4 22:25 29:13 62:23 69:12 70:8 76:14	<b>apology</b> 89:20	<b>assistant</b> 8:15,18 38:9 43:8 65:2 65:6,10,13	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>abuses</b> 4:14 52:12 77:18 93:1	<b>agreeing</b> 23:7,18	<b>appeal</b> 84:3	<b>assistant's</b> 77:1	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>access</b> 7:1 16:21 33:9 34:13 84:19	<b>agreements</b> 84:8	<b>appear</b> 49:2,7	<b>assisting</b> 2:3	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>accident</b> 14:6 25:7	<b>agrees</b> 13:3	<b>appearance</b> 38:15	<b>associate</b> 69:17	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>accord</b> 2:11	<b>Ah</b> 31:6	<b>appears</b> 44:12 59:24	<b>associated</b> 8:14 9:16 58:17	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>account</b> 5:14 78:2	<b>aimed</b> 62:17	<b>application</b> 84:5	<b>associating</b> 22:19	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>accurate</b> 51:24	<b>albeit</b> 62:11	<b>applied</b> 54:18	<b>Association</b> 67:11	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>accurately</b> 20:18 66:16	<b>alerting</b> 37:2	<b>apply</b> 17:19 81:1	<b>assume</b> 23:6,16	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>accused</b> 85:5	<b>alight</b> 49:23	<b>appointment</b> 24:14,24	<b>assumed</b> 68:4	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>accustomed</b> 76:1	<b>alighted</b> 48:13	<b>appreciate</b> 23:8 97:5	<b>assumption</b> 62:12	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>act</b> 22:17,21 69:4 82:17 92:23 95:18	<b>ALISON</b> 99:9	<b>appropriated</b> 12:14 16:3	<b>attract</b> 88:24 89:4	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>acting</b> 6:10	<b>alleged</b> 9:5	<b>appropriation</b> 79:23	<b>audiences</b> 89:11	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>actions</b> 7:3	<b>allow</b> 96:16 98:12	<b>approximate</b> 55:18	<b>authorise</b> 91:13	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>activity</b> 30:19 62:18 71:20	<b>allowed</b> 4:9 21:18 27:19 70:7 92:7 93:10 94:13	<b>approximately</b> 13:6	<b>authors</b> 58:14	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>actor</b> 88:8	<b>alternative</b> 49:13	<b>April</b> 35:7	<b>available</b> 47:8 93:19	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>actors</b> 67:2	<b>alternatively</b> 6:17	<b>area</b> 67:7 79:6	<b>avoidance</b> 34:9	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>add</b> 32:7 59:2 68:8 70:7 95:24	<b>altogether</b> 44:3 50:4 57:13	<b>argue</b> 83:14 89:3	<b>awarded</b> 8:6	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>added</b> 69:23	<b>Amanda</b> 49:24 52:11 74:9	<b>argued</b> 89:17	<b>aware</b> 50:1 86:18	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>bandied</b> 78:19
<b>addition</b> 27:8 85:20	<b>amazingly</b> 24:16	<b>argument</b> 80:1 98:9	<b>A&amp;E</b> 14:9	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	<b>back</b> 3:10,16 5:7 5:10 8:25 9:22 15:5 17:5 19:8 30:7 32:18 41:12 44:9 45:9 46:5 55:21 58:19 71:9,21 72:19 73:4 75:21 81:5,13 84:24 88:19 95:2	

<b>C</b>	62:9,11 72:4 74:1,3 96:18	<b>claims</b> 7:5 10:19 10:20	75:8,9,9 90:15 97:4	49:14 95:24	68:11	34:24
<b>call</b> 8:20,25 40:9 80:21 87:3,4 89:8 93:1	<b>certainly</b> 23:1,3 29:5 41:8 46:16 63:9 70:6 81:17 85:21 91:12 95:22 98:9	<b>clamour</b> 92:21	<b>commenting</b> 40:16 41:3	<b>confirmed</b> 43:22	<b>corrected</b> 71:2,3 77:13	<b>culture</b> 32:9 61:23
<b>called</b> 3:1 15:16 39:1,11 40:5 41:9 45:22 46:8 65:2 67:10	<b>CFAs</b> 85:9,10	<b>clarify</b> 55:11 96:4	<b>comments</b> 70:15	<b>confirming</b> 43:5	<b>correctly</b> 56:20	<b>curiosity</b> 66:23
<b>calling</b> 81:15,17	<b>chance</b> 24:4,8 39:4 45:22 58:2,5,8 82:13 88:17 95:4	<b>clarifying</b> 96:5	<b>commercial</b> 12:15 16:3 93:8	<b>confused</b> 20:14	<b>corruption</b> 27:4	<b>current</b> 82:16
<b>callously</b> 50:25	<b>chances</b> 40:7	<b>clarity</b> 31:22	<b>commercially</b> 83:13	<b>confusing</b> 22:2	<b>couched</b> 75:14	<b>custom</b> 98:14
<b>calls</b> 36:19,20 37:17 38:18 42:10 43:9,10 44:14 64:12 82:8	<b>Charing</b> 10:24	<b>classes</b> 18:17	<b>Commission</b> 12:2	<b>connection</b> 52:14	<b>Coulson</b> 25:11	<b>cut</b> 2:7 25:17
<b>camera</b> 25:6 45:25	<b>charity</b> 15:7,16 15:20	<b>classic</b> 14:17	<b>commissioned</b> 33:22,24 34:18	<b>conscious</b> 1:24 2:2 53:10 94:23	<b>country</b> 61:1,23 62:20,22 67:17 72:22 74:5 76:2 78:17 79:1 82:4 89:23 94:5,17 94:18	<b>cuts</b> 87:13
<b>cameras</b> 45:17	<b>charming</b> 8:15 8:24	<b>classy</b> 64:9	<b>Commissioner</b> 20:13 21:13	<b>consequences</b> 96:13	62:20,22 67:17 72:22 74:5 76:2 78:17 79:1 82:4 89:23 94:5,17 94:18	<b>cyphering</b> 34:10
<b>campaign</b> 54:22 85:10	<b>chased</b> 17:13,21 17:24	<b>clean</b> 30:15 35:23	<b>Commissioner's</b> 20:10 21:9,24 23:23	<b>consider</b> 70:25 72:1	<b>courage</b> 94:15,19	<b>D</b>
<b>campaigning</b> 4:13	<b>chasing</b> 18:23	<b>cleaner</b> 30:15	<b>Commission's</b> 11:25	<b>consideration</b> 90:8	<b>course</b> 2:5,21 3:10 4:10 31:11 34:10 40:11 54:14,21 66:22 67:1 70:23 71:2 74:15,15 77:20 80:4 90:14,18 94:9 95:20,25 97:12	<b>D</b> 99:2
<b>campaigns</b> 85:23	<b>chat</b> 8:22	<b>clear</b> 32:4,12 42:23 53:11 57:11 81:18 85:14,17 86:23 92:16 95:6 98:8	<b>common</b> 17:15 87:2 90:14 92:23	<b>considered</b> 62:9 97:18	<b>courtesy</b> 94:18	<b>Daily</b> 9:19 19:5 28:4,12 29:1 29:15 30:20 33:16,17 34:2 34:2,3 37:24 42:11,23 44:7 44:13,15,18,19 45:1 49:24 50:5 51:19 52:22 53:16 69:1,2 74:8 87:10 91:21
<b>cannibal</b> 48:11	<b>check</b> 61:9	<b>clearly</b> 96:19 21:23	<b>commonly</b> 78:14	<b>consistently</b> 43:10	<b>couple</b> 33:16 89:7 97:15	42:11,23 44:7 44:13,15,18,19 45:1 49:24 50:5 51:19 52:22 53:16 69:1,2 74:8 87:10 91:21
<b>Caplan</b> 9:15 95:11,16 97:13	<b>checked</b> 37:19 42:13	<b>close</b> 20:25 80:10 92:22	<b>company</b> 8:14	<b>constant</b> 88:22	<b>courage</b> 94:15,19	<b>dam</b> 37:16
<b>car</b> 17:25 18:3 20:8 24:9,12 24:16 25:2,6 45:16,25 46:3 46:6	<b>Chelsea</b> 13:15	<b>closed</b> 27:2 44:12	<b>competitive</b> 25:12	<b>consult</b> 65:23	<b>course</b> 2:5,21 3:10 4:10 31:11 34:10 40:11 54:14,21 66:22 67:1 70:23 71:2 74:15,15 77:20 80:4 90:14,18 94:9 95:20,25 97:12	<b>damage</b> 5:2,4 76:24 77:4 97:1
<b>care</b> 89:6,12	<b>child</b> 36:25 41:24 41:25 45:15,18 45:19,24 49:14 50:13 53:7 70:22	<b>closely</b> 56:15	<b>complainant</b> 11:22	<b>contact</b> 39:7 20:25 76:6 95:5	<b>courts</b> 8:7 10:15 34:14 84:15 97:12	<b>damages</b> 8:6 15:6
<b>cared</b> 89:11	<b>children</b> 17:16 17:19,21,22,25 17:25 18:3,24	<b>clue</b> 35:12	<b>complaint</b> 11:11 11:13,20,23 12:6,9,22,25 13:12 14:12,25 51:21	<b>content</b> 56:9	<b>cousin</b> 42:5,6 52:22	<b>damaging</b> 62:25 78:17
<b>career</b> 2:21,22 3:2 88:20,21 89:11	<b>child's</b> 41:13 71:17	<b>cocoon</b> 88:16	<b>complaining</b> 71:7	<b>contest</b> 21:2	<b>cover</b> 4:6 14:17 19:14 45:11 63:15	<b>danger</b> 21:21 41:23
<b>careful</b> 20:6,7,7 27:25 31:7 78:19	<b>chilling</b> 82:22	<b>code</b> 47:11	<b>completely</b> 8:5 10:9 59:7	<b>context</b> 55:22 74:9	<b>coverage</b> 89:14	<b>dangerous</b> 45:14
<b>carefully</b> 29:4 81:19	<b>chin</b> 48:23	<b>Code</b> 80:25	<b>complimentary</b> 50:4	<b>contract</b> 91:12	<b>covered</b> 51:7,8 55:12 93:12	<b>dark</b> 78:6
<b>carriageway</b> 24:17,17	<b>Chinese</b> 52:23	<b>collateral</b> 76:24 77:4	<b>comprised</b> 80:23	<b>contractual</b> 87:19	<b>covered</b> 51:7,8 55:12 93:12	<b>darker</b> 4:3
<b>carry</b> 85:16	<b>chipping</b> 26:11	<b>come</b> 5:23 7:22 8:8 9:22 12:15 12:16 15:5 19:8,10,16 21:3 22:7,13 24:18 27:5 28:19 44:14 62:7 73:4 81:25 84:17 89:14 91:7 97:19 98:21	<b>compulsory</b> 79:12	<b>contrary</b> 96:15	<b>covert</b> 92:5	<b>data</b> 22:15,16,21 41:16 55:18
<b>case</b> 10:13 17:6 18:12 22:5 25:6 28:13 31:15 32:17 33:15 37:23 42:11 49:4 71:13,24 78:25 82:18,24 83:1 83:17,19 84:2 85:2,3,4 96:23	<b>choice</b> 6:5	<b>comes</b> 17:3 55:2 62:5 64:17,22 66:18,20 67:9 69:4 82:9 83:9 87:16 95:12	<b>computer</b> 16:22	<b>contribute</b> 10:16	<b>co-regulation</b> 80:22	<b>date</b> 13:3,5,6 41:16 55:18
<b>cases</b> 16:11 17:17 83:2,16 84:21 85:21	<b>Chris</b> 85:5	<b>comfortable</b> 31:25	<b>conceivable</b> 9:2	<b>contribution</b> 71:22	<b>create</b> 69:18 88:14 92:24	<b>dated</b> 1:10 42:20
<b>celebrities</b> 76:15	<b>Christmas</b> 24:13	<b>coming</b> 1:23 40:20 46:8 64:1,4 75:21	<b>concern</b> 39:12 52:12 98:18	<b>control</b> 67:12	<b>credit</b> 27:8 50:11	<b>dates</b> 53:19,20
<b>celebrity's</b> 52:4	<b>Christmassy</b> 24:15	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>concerned</b> 36:7,8 61:13 80:8,12	<b>controlled</b> 19:9	<b>crime</b> 18:19	<b>daughter</b> 59:16
<b>cent</b> 71:20 87:11 87:12,15 88:1 88:2	<b>Christopher</b> 77:6	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>concerns</b> 23:14	<b>controversial</b> 30:23 31:1	<b>crimes</b> 77:8	<b>day</b> 5:9,13,14 38:25 41:13 42:6,9 50:25 54:19 57:12,14 98:24
<b>central</b> 77:20	<b>chronology</b> 41:17 53:15 55:1	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>conclusion</b> 52:24 94:2	<b>controversy</b> 30:23 31:1	<b>criminal</b> 18:17 18:18	<b>deal</b> 3:20 7:2 12:10 17:8 24:5 39:17 45:8 53:14 77:17 80:1 90:4 96:13
<b>certain</b> 15:12 33:19 51:8	<b>cinema</b> 3:15	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>conditional</b> 84:7	<b>convenient</b> 53:3 80:3 83:22 88:17	<b>critical</b> 74:14 75:15	<b>deals</b> 64:15 64:16 65:19
	<b>circular</b> 20:1	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>conducted</b> 91:12	<b>convention</b> 53:3 80:3 83:22 88:17	<b>criticise</b> 67:22 88:18	<b>December</b> 54:9
	<b>circumstance</b> 61:18	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>conference</b> 67:10	<b>copy</b> 34:25 35:23 35:24 56:23	<b>cross</b> 10:24	<b>decency</b> 16:5 18:11
	<b>circumstances</b> 48:10	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>confidence</b> 11:3	<b>core</b> 96:20	<b>crossed</b> 46:3	<b>decide</b> 71:10 83:10
	<b>citizen</b> 16:1	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>confidential</b> 12:24	<b>corner</b> 33:20 34:10,13	<b>crosshairs</b> 5:24 67:18	<b>decided</b> 6:18 43:6 47:20
	<b>citizens</b> 79:24 82:5 93:8,9	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>confidentiality</b> 11:23	<b>cornerstone</b> 94:9	<b>cross-fertilisati...</b> 78:5	<b>decision</b> 2:1
	<b>civil</b> 54:14	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>confine</b> 40:17	<b>correct</b> 5:3 6:13 11:4 36:12,16 45:17 56:18 59:4 65:24	<b>crying</b> 18:1	
	<b>civilised</b> 73:2	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>confined</b> 77:18	<b>correctly</b> 5:3 6:13 11:4 36:12,16 45:17 56:18 59:4 65:24	<b>culminate</b> 11:2	
	<b>claim</b> 11:2,6 54:6	<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21	<b>confirm</b> 1:12 43:17 48:14	<b>correctly</b> 5:3 6:13 11:4 36:12,16 45:17 56:18 59:4 65:24	<b>culminated</b> 45:9	
		<b>comment</b> 3:6 14:4 15:5 23:11 29:7 30:18 36:14,17 38:2,7 43:1,4 49:17 59:25 65:1,6,7 68:13 69:9,14 70:5 70:11 74:21		<b>culminating</b>		

54:14 69:21 96:7 97:12 <b>decisions</b> 98:13 <b>declined</b> 65:1 <b>deep</b> 11:11 <b>defamation</b> 10:19 71:4 <b>defamatory</b> 71:5 <b>defaults</b> 19:20 <b>defence</b> 82:25 83:7 85:16,22 86:17 87:2 90:20,22 92:19 97:25 <b>defences</b> 86:5 <b>defend</b> 83:3 <b>defending</b> 93:16 <b>definitely</b> 5:17 20:19 35:10 85:24 <b>definition</b> 69:10 <b>degree</b> 15:12 <b>delay</b> 12:2 <b>deliberate</b> 75:5 <b>deliberately</b> 15:2 <b>delighted</b> 47:25 48:17 49:15 50:13 <b>democracy</b> 94:10 <b>denial</b> 58:23 <b>denials</b> 60:15 <b>denied</b> 59:20 <b>deny</b> 43:17 <b>department</b> 14:6 <b>departments</b> 14:10 <b>depends</b> 84:7,9 <b>depicted</b> 56:20 <b>deployed</b> 1:25 <b>deprive</b> 92:17 <b>describe</b> 2:23 3:8 <b>described</b> 9:1 57:24 58:3 81:20,21 <b>desperate</b> 6:22 7:1 64:5 <b>despite</b> 73:3 <b>detail</b> 19:14 35:5 36:8 38:13 56:9 <b>detailed</b> 5:14 55:15 <b>details</b> 11:1 14:5 16:20 20:19,23 22:23 30:19 37:25 55:16,17 <b>detective</b> 20:22 21:19 <b>development</b> 86:25 <b>devise</b> 72:10 <b>Diana</b> 19:4 <b>die</b> 89:15 <b>died</b> 19:4 <b>difference</b> 78:21 86:19 97:10	<b>different</b> 16:10 18:19 57:12 58:12 <b>difficult</b> 2:1,1 22:15 23:25 63:7 78:21 79:3 94:8 <b>dig</b> 51:17 <b>digitally</b> 19:1 <b>dimension</b> 69:23 <b>dinner</b> 59:4,5,7 <b>dip</b> 71:20 <b>direct</b> 19:25 39:22 40:1 77:25 <b>directed</b> 74:7 <b>dirt</b> 51:17 <b>dirty</b> 30:16 <b>disagree</b> 43:23 <b>disagreeing</b> 23:7 23:18 <b>disband</b> 92:24 <b>disclosure</b> 34:15 <b>discovered</b> 21:25 <b>discuss</b> 36:8 <b>discussing</b> 31:24 <b>discussion</b> 22:20 95:15 99:17 <b>distinction</b> 79:3 <b>diva</b> 87:24 <b>Divisional</b> 97:11 <b>dizzy</b> 14:25 <b>document</b> 13:2 <b>doing</b> 3:14 37:6 62:20 64:8,8 66:8 67:4 70:10 71:8 74:21 75:11 88:6 90:2 <b>domain</b> 9:6 31:17 32:8 68:12,13 69:7 69:7,10,25 70:4,5 97:1 <b>domestic</b> 73:7 <b>door</b> 5:1,11 46:3 <b>doorstep</b> 40:8 <b>dot</b> 30:11,11 <b>dots</b> 30:11 <b>doubly</b> 6:2 <b>doubt</b> 34:9 95:6 <b>Doubtless</b> 13:8 <b>Dover</b> 25:5 <b>DOWLER</b> 99:4 99:4 <b>Dowlers</b> 76:21 85:1 <b>dozen</b> 7:9 <b>draft</b> 95:20 <b>draw</b> 52:24 80:25 <b>drawn</b> 36:23 57:24 66:7 74:19 <b>dress</b> 86:1 <b>dressed</b> 15:2 48:11	<b>drinking</b> 29:19 29:20,21 <b>dropped</b> 9:10 25:16 59:7 <b>drove</b> 46:3 <b>drum</b> 87:17 <b>drunk</b> 29:22 <b>dual</b> 24:17 <b>dumped</b> 49:3 <b>dying</b> 89:25 <hr/> <b>E</b> <hr/> <b>E</b> 99:2 <b>earlier</b> 9:16 28:6 32:19 44:22 55:12 70:17 75:21 76:22 78:4 90:25 <b>early</b> 17:23 19:22 88:20 <b>Easter</b> 35:7 <b>easy</b> 81:7 <b>echo</b> 78:3 <b>editor</b> 25:4 83:13 <b>effect</b> 49:15 50:2 82:22 <b>efficiency</b> 54:24 <b>effort</b> 11:8 94:23 <b>efforts</b> 51:17 <b>egregious</b> 14:18 47:2 77:18 <b>eighth</b> 85:15 <b>either</b> 6:9 10:10 15:6 17:1 18:9 31:13 59:10 60:14 65:9 66:3 67:19 81:2 83:20 88:15 <b>elaborate</b> 76:5 78:11 <b>elegance</b> 74:4,4 <b>elegant</b> 15:18 <b>else's</b> 41:3 65:23 <b>emails</b> 20:1 42:20 43:7 <b>emanate</b> 19:21 63:3 <b>emanated</b> 63:4 <b>emanates</b> 61:7 <b>embellish</b> 70:7 70:11 <b>embellishment</b> 71:1 <b>embellishments</b> 69:15 <b>emerged</b> 92:22 <b>emergency</b> 14:6 54:19 <b>emerges</b> 96:24 <b>emphatically</b> 4:15 59:12 <b>employed</b> 72:11 <b>employee</b> 16:15 <b>employs</b> 21:13 <b>encapsulated</b> 92:13	<b>encounter</b> 24:4,8 <b>encountered</b> 25:7 <b>ended</b> 14:5 15:5 24:9 <b>endless</b> 15:12 <b>endlessly</b> 78:18 <b>ends</b> 25:23 <b>English</b> 8:16,21 8:22 52:23 <b>enjoy</b> 3:15 <b>enjoyable</b> 87:11 <b>enjoyed</b> 3:1 25:12 <b>enjoying</b> 18:1 51:18 <b>ensemble</b> 88:10 <b>enshrined</b> 91:17 <b>ensures</b> 96:17 <b>entered</b> 68:12 <b>entertaining</b> 89:12,16 <b>entirely</b> 10:4 12:13 24:22 43:14 60:24 77:9 88:14 96:5 97:12 <b>entitled</b> 70:23 <b>episode</b> 36:25 <b>equation</b> 75:13 <b>especially</b> 17:23 50:10 84:15 <b>essential</b> 12:22 <b>essentially</b> 96:3 <b>establish</b> 84:12 <b>establishing</b> 84:9 <b>et</b> 38:1 67:24 82:23 <b>ethics</b> 18:21 32:9 81:1 98:15 <b>event</b> 24:4 26:8 47:2 <b>events</b> 4:6 34:23 39:13 71:8,13 <b>eventually</b> 12:25 68:12 69:4 <b>everybody</b> 2:21 13:3 58:18 95:3 98:14 <b>everyone's</b> 70:23 <b>evidence</b> 2:4,16 2:16,17,18 16:13 21:21,25 22:23 23:9 27:18,21 28:2 28:3,4 29:7 33:1 39:22,23 39:25 40:17,18 42:16 44:16 51:4 52:10 53:12 56:16 59:17 77:22,25 95:5 96:14,16 96:19,25 98:4 98:5,7 <b>exact</b> 14:24 46:15	<b>exactly</b> 14:22 19:22 40:23 91:16 <b>example</b> 7:17 17:12 36:22 40:25 41:2 60:19 65:22 96:19 <b>examples</b> 7:16 10:19,20 42:19 76:16,17 89:13 <b>excellent</b> 78:25 <b>exclude</b> 39:20 <b>excluded</b> 84:25 <b>executive</b> 8:4,10 8:17,25 65:13 <b>exercising</b> 74:21 95:17 <b>exhibit</b> 35:17,17 42:17 <b>exist</b> 59:20 69:18 <b>existence</b> 73:2 <b>expect</b> 16:1,2 50:14 76:2 91:7 <b>expectation</b> 90:23 91:18 <b>expected</b> 4:18 <b>experience</b> 2:2 41:3,4 69:13 71:9 <b>experienced</b> 40:19 70:16 <b>experiences</b> 81:20 <b>expert</b> 56:16 81:14 <b>experts</b> 64:18,20 80:24 <b>expires</b> 95:19 96:1 <b>explain</b> 18:8 31:4 87:8 <b>explained</b> 33:2 34:11 <b>explanation</b> 9:20 <b>explored</b> 32:15 <b>expose</b> 55:15 <b>exposes</b> 85:15,15 86:3 <b>express</b> 9:25 10:13,17 15:9 15:19 77:19 81:7 <b>expressed</b> 84:2 <b>extensive</b> 25:9 80:12 <b>extent</b> 80:8 <b>extra</b> 69:23 <b>extramarital</b> 85:25 <b>extraordinary</b> 51:16 <b>extrapolating</b> 22:22 <b>extremely</b> 1:24 31:7 76:1	<b>ex-client</b> 20:3 <b>ex-clients</b> 20:2 <b>ex-lover</b> 51:19 <b>ex-News</b> 25:4 <b>ex-police</b> 21:13 <b>ex-policeman</b> 23:22 <b>eye</b> 40:22 73:3 88:22 89:22 <hr/> <b>F</b> <hr/> <b>fact</b> 2:17,18 23:7 34:11,16 40:10 43:18 50:19,20 50:23,25 52:9 56:17 57:17 60:8 70:21 73:3 77:9 86:9 <b>factor</b> 71:24 <b>facts</b> 46:15 61:9 69:22 70:19 75:3 <b>actual</b> 74:10 <b>fail</b> 12:13 <b>failure</b> 82:14 <b>fair</b> 4:22 13:21 16:6 17:17 27:21 43:6,20 57:22 58:13,16 58:18 65:7 67:7 68:14 <b>fairer</b> 51:23 <b>fairly</b> 3:10 <b>faith</b> 71:12 <b>faithfully</b> 50:22 <b>fake</b> 37:19,25 <b>falsities</b> 50:17 <b>families</b> 76:23 <b>family</b> 85:23 86:12 92:3 <b>famous</b> 14:8 17:3 33:19 <b>fantastic</b> 16:24 65:13 82:11 <b>far</b> 10:9 48:18 73:20 <b>fascinating</b> 25:8 <b>fashionable</b> 76:1 <b>fast</b> 46:4 <b>faster</b> 62:14 88:5 <b>father</b> 48:17 49:15,17 51:1 <b>father's</b> 77:2 <b>fault</b> 68:23 <b>Faustian</b> 87:1 90:5 <b>favour</b> 54:9 88:4 <b>favourable</b> 3:6,7 <b>fawning</b> 94:5 <b>fears</b> 42:14 <b>features</b> 25:4 <b>February</b> 7:17 7:25 <b>fee</b> 84:8 <b>feel</b> 2:6 26:25 93:6,23 94:16 <b>fell</b> 12:7	<b>felt</b> 12:10 48:25 75:8 95:1 <b>female</b> 42:6 <b>fending</b> 64:3 <b>Ferdinand</b> 83:17 84:2 <b>field</b> 80:24 <b>fields</b> 18:19 <b>fifth</b> 79:8 82:16 <b>figure</b> 61:3 <b>film</b> 2:23 3:1,13 3:23 64:1,4,17 66:9,11 67:3 73:19 86:21 87:12,16,21 88:1,8,11,12 89:12 91:21 <b>filming</b> 48:10 <b>filmmakers</b> 88:25 89:4 <b>films</b> 64:10 66:15 87:11 88:14 89:7,10,13 <b>final</b> 39:17 93:24 97:8 <b>finalise</b> 97:24 <b>finally</b> 11:8,10 25:2 <b>financial</b> 81:2 <b>find</b> 1:9 20:18 21:12 35:11,16 42:18 44:4 48:3 57:18,20 59:18 81:10 92:4 93:18 <b>fine</b> 6:20,20 32:3 50:14 74:22,23 74:24 75:25 85:13 90:18,18 <b>fined</b> 81:11 <b>finish</b> 51:4 <b>first</b> 1:9,13 10:22 12:23 13:18 17:18,20 21:20 26:9,14 28:12 29:11 34:4 35:2,14,17 41:10 46:20 50:9,9 53:16 54:15 55:12 56:14 68:19 72:17 76:6,13 82:23 93:1,15 97:15 <b>fishing</b> 38:4 <b>fits</b> 41:16 <b>five</b> 25:12 30:14 <b>flat</b> 4:24 5:3,8,10 5:15 6:3,12,18 <b>flatly</b> 15:19 <b>flecting</b> 15:2 <b>fleeting</b> 48:19 <b>flimsy</b> 86:6 <b>flippant</b> 67:19 68:3 <b>flirtatious</b> 8:3,12 <b>floor</b> 4:24
--	--	--	--	--	---	---

<b>floors</b> 6:24	<b>fully</b> 32:15 78:2	<b>given</b> 10:11 27:8	<b>grandmother</b>	40:6 41:20	<b>historically</b>	<b>illegal</b> 38:7 68:8
<b>focused</b> 13:1	<b>function</b> 64:14	30:3,5,18	45:15,23 46:13	47:7	94:17	79:24 92:17
<b>focusing</b> 63:10	<b>fundamental</b>	49:10 51:16	54:17	<b>happens</b> 8:16	<b>history</b> 68:25	<b>illegally</b> 66:25
73:8	16:4 79:24	52:8 54:9	<b>grant</b> 1:3,4,6,7,8	10:7 61:24,25	<b>hitting</b> 77:20	67:6 68:17
<b>folder</b> 56:21	92:18 96:7	59:25 65:14	1:19,22 2:13	68:11 84:3,24	<b>HJK</b> 96:12 98:3	<b>imagine</b> 7:8 21:3
<b>follow</b> 2:18 13:1	<b>Funeral</b> 2:24 3:5	66:2 67:9 76:5	13:18,24 15:21	<b>happier</b> 48:20	98:17	23:25 35:10
14:13 22:17	3:11 89:5	76:16,17 77:25	19:13 21:23	<b>happily</b> 51:18	<b>hold</b> 47:18 52:25	<b>immediately</b>
54:14	<b>Funnily</b> 86:14	78:4	24:5 26:2	89:23	<b>holding</b> 56:15,17	30:10 38:25
<b>followed</b> 17:24	<b>funny</b> 3:14 88:16	<b>gives</b> 52:12 88:17	27:15 29:17	<b>happy</b> 13:18	<b>holed</b> 5:8	54:22
37:9	<b>further</b> 15:5	90:15 98:4	31:1,22 34:24	25:7 35:7 42:4	<b>Hollywood</b> 8:16	<b>impact</b> 61:2
<b>following</b> 3:4 7:2	49:17 95:21	<b>giving</b> 41:16 52:9	35:23 38:23	82:2 96:2,4	67:11 68:2	62:18 96:6
19:4 57:11,14	<b>fuss</b> 83:21	53:12 56:16	39:23 48:17	<b>hard</b> 26:19 49:10	<b>home</b> 18:14 42:3	<b>impacted</b> 61:24
71:18 98:24	<b>future</b> 88:24	59:17 60:19	53:7,17 54:3	52:24 61:10	<b>honest</b> 20:14	<b>implied</b> 77:8
<b>foot</b> 95:2	92:12	91:4	55:7,11 56:25	<b>harsh</b> 27:6	47:24 49:1	<b>important</b> 4:11
<b>football</b> 86:11	<hr/> <b>G</b> <hr/>	<b>glamourising</b>	58:5,14 63:14	<b>hasty</b> 48:9	64:21	4:20 23:8
<b>footballer</b> 86:9	<b>gain</b> 6:11	91:25	68:4 76:3	<b>hatchet</b> 50:14,15	<b>Hong's</b> 38:20	38:12 48:25
<b>forced</b> 5:1	<b>gazillions</b> 89:5	<b>Globes</b> 67:12	85:15 86:23	50:18,23 52:11	<b>hope</b> 16:22 42:17	88:7
<b>Foreign</b> 67:11	<b>general</b> 7:4	<b>glove</b> 25:6	93:11,21 94:22	52:15 67:23	58:18 80:10	<b>improper</b> 46:19
68:2	98:16	<b>gnash</b> 70:18	95:12 98:16	70:18 75:5	91:3 93:20	<b>improve</b> 78:15
<b>foreshadowing</b>	<b>generally</b> 62:9	<b>go</b> 7:14 11:1 12:5	99:15	<b>hate</b> 58:21 75:25	96:25	<b>inaccuracies</b>
21:21	74:10	18:3 26:6,7	<b>granted</b> 53:6	87:25	<b>horror</b> 24:23	74:10
<b>forever</b> 91:7,9	<b>generous</b> 54:4	28:13 29:11	54:20 96:11	<b>head</b> 37:6 39:6	<b>HOSKINS</b> 99:10	<b>incident</b> 4:23
<b>forget</b> 89:19,20	<b>gentleman</b> 23:21	32:6,9 35:4,14	<b>Grant's</b> 54:17	51:3 59:15	<b>hospital</b> 10:24	32:18 45:9,14
<b>form</b> 48:3,7,7,12	<b>German</b> 50:20	46:11 47:21	<b>grapple</b> 63:8	64:12 67:23	13:15 14:6,23	54:16
48:24 49:22	50:21 57:19	55:21 56:8	<b>grappling</b> 61:6	<b>heading</b> 79:16	16:16,24 17:1	<b>including</b> 33:19
80:10 93:13	59:3,5 60:9	64:10 67:7	<b>grateful</b> 1:23 2:3	<b>headline</b> 36:7	37:14,15,18,20	52:11 80:21
97:1	74:11	76:8 83:20	53:9,13	58:10	37:25 38:6	<b>inconsistent</b> 50:7
<b>formal</b> 33:3 48:4	<b>Germany</b> 48:10	84:14,16,20,21	<b>gravitas</b> 62:9	<b>health</b> 15:18,25	41:13,23 42:4	<b>incontestable</b>
<b>formally</b> 33:4	60:2,4,17	87:8 92:7	<b>great</b> 3:20 8:13	64:25	43:15 44:1	43:17
34:14	<b>getting</b> 24:24	<b>God</b> 75:20	24:19 45:25	<b>Healthtalkonline</b>	52:3,18 53:23	<b>incorrect</b> 22:2
<b>forms</b> 80:18	59:9 64:3,11	<b>goes</b> 26:15 29:10	84:25 86:11	15:17	71:11	71:1
<b>forthcoming</b>	78:12 95:3	72:19 88:19	<b>greeting</b> 35:6	<b>hear</b> 2:15 6:24	<b>hour</b> 50:24 70:21	<b>increasingly</b>
91:5	<b>gigantic</b> 88:12	<b>going</b> 1:19 4:6	<b>grey</b> 79:6,6	9:19 26:19	76:3	18:16,17
<b>found</b> 6:18 33:17	<b>Giggs</b> 86:7,10	9:7 12:5 14:4	<b>grind</b> 50:16	29:18 67:3	<b>hours</b> 11:17	<b>incredibly</b> 44:5
92:5 94:19	<b>Giles</b> 50:1	22:25 23:9	<b>gross</b> 15:1	79:19 97:7	47:21 61:11	<b>Independent</b>
97:2	<b>girl</b> 8:21 48:17	24:14 26:6,21	<b>ground</b> 93:12	<b>heard</b> 32:21	71:21	21:16 86:14
<b>four</b> 2:23 3:5,11	49:20 51:12	31:5 32:6,6	<b>grounds</b> 83:4	53:13 54:23	<b>house</b> 20:20	<b>indicate</b> 2:8
6:24 7:6 30:14	57:9,10,15,16	34:20 35:4	<b>Group</b> 81:7	61:25 77:23	28:20 45:18	<b>individual</b> 63:10
79:13 89:5	57:17,21 58:11	38:1 39:20	<b>Guardian</b> 50:4	78:3 90:19	49:25 71:17,20	<b>individuals</b>
<b>fourth</b> 4:24	59:5,9 60:23	41:12 42:8,13	82:19,24	97:23,24	<b>Housekeeping</b>	45:16
<b>France</b> 72:25	92:3	42:18 45:8,9	<b>guess</b> 16:8	<b>hearing</b> 21:22	99:3	<b>individual's</b>
<b>frankly</b> 9:11	<b>girlfriend</b> 3:25	47:21 58:19	<b>guessing</b> 19:22	32:12 98:24	<b>Hugh</b> 1:3,4,7	12:13
31:21	8:1 17:13,18	61:11 63:15	<b>guilty</b> 77:8	<b>heavily</b> 77:8	37:18 38:23	<b>industry</b> 82:3,6
<b>free</b> 78:17 94:9	17:20,20,22	68:5 76:4	<hr/> <b>H</b> <hr/>	85:11	42:12 48:17,20	87:3 92:22
<b>freelance</b> 18:7,15	18:23 40:7	84:23 86:17	<b>hacked</b> 32:23	<b>heinous</b> 77:8	57:15 58:10	<b>ineffectual</b> 71:23
18:24 28:9,23	41:8 48:2,4	96:13 98:1,13	77:1	<b>held</b> 37:8 47:15	99:15	<b>inference</b> 41:1
72:6,7	<b>Golden</b> 67:12	<b>good</b> 3:7 24:18	<b>hacking</b> 7:23	<b>hell</b> 6:4 12:17	<b>human</b> 74:15	43:20 65:8
<b>free-for-all</b> 80:5	28:12 29:11	28:12 29:11	9:21 19:13	37:5,7	76:18 82:17	<b>inferences</b> 57:23
<b>frequently</b> 17:23	32:14 37:4	32:14 37:4	21:25 22:24	<b>help</b> 24:18 55:17	92:18,23	<b>infinite</b> 85:12
19:19 90:20	43:25 48:18	43:25 48:18	25:10 27:4	68:18,21 80:15	<b>humane</b> 73:2	<b>influence</b> 82:4
<b>Friday</b> 54:19	51:1,13,13	51:1,13,13	28:5 29:16	88:21 91:9	<b>hundreds</b> 87:21	<b>information</b>
97:21	64:19 79:4	64:19 79:4	30:10,19 33:22	<b>helpful</b> 32:17	89:22	11:24 12:24
<b>friend</b> 8:13 25:3	86:16,18,18	86:16,18,18	33:25 85:2	<b>helps</b> 28:19	<b>hypocrite</b> 86:2	20:10,13 21:9
48:4 51:13,13	87:13,14 93:2	87:13,14 93:2	92:2	<b>HG1</b> 10:1 13:21	<b>hypocritical</b> 87:7	21:13,24 23:23
69:16	93:4 94:17	93:4 94:17	<b>hacks</b> 50:22	13:24 25:21	88:18	37:25 43:14
<b>friends</b> 21:1 75:4	<b>goodwill</b> 3:12	<b>goodwill</b> 3:12	<b>half</b> 7:9 50:24	<b>HG2</b> 35:2,17	<b>hypothesis</b> 6:12	44:1,2 49:20
<b>friendship</b> 58:24	<b>Google</b> 31:19	<b>Google</b> 31:19	70:21 76:3	42:17	<hr/> <b>I</b> <hr/>	66:25 67:6
<b>frightened</b> 18:4	<b>googlies</b> 58:21	<b>googlies</b> 58:21	<b>hand</b> 1:12 50:12	<b>Hi</b> 8:18	<b>icy</b> 24:15	68:11,17 69:3
37:11	<b>government</b>	<b>government</b>	56:18,23 92:8	<b>hiatus</b> 64:10	<b>idea</b> 7:4 57:17	69:6
<b>front</b> 5:1,11 35:6	85:11 92:10	85:11 92:10	<b>handed</b> 35:23	<b>high</b> 17:13 18:22	82:10 87:1	<b>initially</b> 3:5 63:5
45:10	<b>governments</b>	<b>governments</b>	56:25	<b>highest</b> 9:11	<b>ideal</b> 48:10	<b>initials</b> 33:21
<b>frustrated</b> 66:17	25:13 93:10	25:13 93:10	<b>hands</b> 56:15,17	<b>highly</b> 29:6 44:4	<b>ideas</b> 81:17	<b>injunction</b> 34:24
<b>frustrating</b>	<b>gradations</b> 80:4	<b>gradations</b> 80:4	64:22 76:15	78:6 80:3	<b>identical</b> 44:21	45:10 46:20
66:14	80:8,21	80:8,21	<b>happen</b> 49:22	88:17	<b>identified</b> 98:12	47:2 54:13,19
<b>fuck</b> 38:23	<b>GRAHAM</b>	<b>GRAHAM</b>	<b>happened</b> 4:19	<b>hinges</b> 5:1,12	<b>identify</b> 12:21	71:14 83:2,15
<b>full</b> 1:6 30:25	99:12	99:12	20:20 37:17	<b>hirable</b> 89:9	<b>illegal</b> 38:7 68:8	<b>injunctions</b>
95:7,8				<b>hired</b> 21:19	79:24 92:17	82:21 83:22

<b>innocent</b> 59:5,7 77:3,5,9	<b>interviews</b> 66:2 90:25	63:14 65:12 72:1 74:7 77:17 82:16 93:11,21 94:20 95:4 97:14,15 98:2,3 99:6,8 99:13,16	95:1,10,12 96:2 97:14,19 98:8 99:11,14	<b>L</b>	61:13,16,21 62:3,17,23 63:2,8,12 72:1 72:7,9,18 73:6 73:13,23 74:6 77:10,13 79:12 81:16 93:18 94:22 95:1,10 95:12 96:2 97:14,19 98:8 99:11,14	<b>look</b> 15:15 28:8 33:5 35:2 42:9 56:1,17 58:2,6 59:18 61:18 63:16 85:1 97:8				
<b>innuendo</b> 57:23	<b>intimate</b> 20:23	93:11,21 94:20 95:4 97:14,15 98:2,3 99:6,8 99:13,16	<b>justifiable</b> 97:3 <b>justifiably</b> 81:21 <b>justified</b> 42:15 <b>justify</b> 68:8	<b>LA</b> 8:21 <b>label</b> 65:15 <b>lady</b> 8:16 <b>language</b> 58:12 75:15 <b>large</b> 88:10 <b>largely</b> 75:22 <b>late</b> 24:14 <b>late-night</b> 8:2 <b>law</b> 82:16 92:22 92:23 <b>laws</b> 72:25 <b>lawsuit</b> 15:15 <b>lawsuits</b> 15:13 <b>lawyer</b> 27:19 32:25,25 39:1 45:20 71:5,14 89:17 <b>lawyers</b> 19:16 20:2 96:20 <b>lawyer's</b> 7:10 <b>lazy</b> 60:20 70:19 74:25 <b>lead</b> 79:9 80:11 <b>leading</b> 27:15,19 48:23 <b>leads</b> 83:23 <b>leak</b> 6:9 37:15,20 39:4 41:1,23 42:14 <b>leaked</b> 43:14,25 <b>leaks</b> 39:12,22 <b>learned</b> 24:2 <b>leave</b> 8:20,24 9:22 18:13 23:1 28:18 31:21 <b>left</b> 26:4 28:20 29:3 53:8 <b>left-field</b> 8:9 <b>left-hand</b> 33:20 34:13 <b>legal</b> 36:22 54:6 90:8 <b>legislate</b> 78:15 <b>length</b> 87:8 <b>lens</b> 24:19 35:9 36:9 44:25 <b>letter</b> 71:18 <b>let's</b> 28:8 39:3 56:1 70:8 <b>level</b> 74:15 <b>Leveson</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2 13:8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 59:17 60:1,16 60:22,24 61:6	<b>libel</b> 7:3,4 8:5 89:18 93:1,4 <b>libelled</b> 84:13 <b>libellous</b> 60:19 <b>licence</b> 90:11,15 93:7 <b>life</b> 3:19,21 9:2 15:10 37:5,6,7 66:15 68:7 71:17 86:4,17 90:22 <b>lifelong</b> 90:10 <b>lift</b> 24:25 25:1 <b>light-hearted</b> 67:13,14 <b>liked</b> 3:13 <b>likes</b> 86:1 <b>limit</b> 96:1 <b>limited</b> 2:13 22:20,21 <b>limiting</b> 29:7 <b>line</b> 58:25 67:16 <b>link</b> 37:13 <b>linked</b> 34:12 <b>list</b> 20:5 89:22 <b>listen</b> 26:22 28:20 31:23 60:14 70:15 <b>listening</b> 6:23 <b>literally</b> 97:21 <b>litigation</b> 10:22 <b>little</b> 3:16 16:17 17:14 19:3 32:24 47:11 51:4 60:12 64:17,25 68:24 69:15 81:12 87:23,25 88:3 91:12 <b>live</b> 88:16 <b>lives</b> 66:23 <b>living</b> 80:2 <b>loathed</b> 52:13 <b>local</b> 59:2 <b>logical</b> 6:8 <b>London</b> 4:24 5:8 38:9 65:11 76:22 <b>long</b> 12:19 13:4,6 14:10 15:13 24:19 25:17 37:8,22 44:25 55:7 76:2 90:2 92:7 93:10 <b>longer</b> 13:22 25:22	<b>intruding</b> 50:6 <b>intrusion</b> 15:1 51:21 53:11 90:19 <b>intrusions</b> 17:9 52:2 87:6 <b>invaded</b> 77:3 <b>invading</b> 68:22 <b>invasion</b> 15:23 52:4 87:3 <b>invented</b> 49:19 50:21,21 59:10 66:4 69:18 <b>investigate</b> 46:12 77:22 91:13 <b>investigation</b> 31:5 32:5 46:24 <b>investigator</b> 20:22 <b>invitation</b> 49:18 80:16 <b>invite</b> 1:11 67:22 <b>invited</b> 95:21 <b>involved</b> 27:22 28:4 29:16 30:9 38:24 46:7,16,17 <b>involves</b> 13:14 <b>involving</b> 4:23 11:23 <b>ironic</b> 49:11 <b>irrespective</b> 72:11 <b>irreverent</b> 94:8 <b>issue</b> 7:20 13:12 19:13 23:1 27:2 55:21 70:25 77:17 95:11 97:11 98:3 <b>issued</b> 54:6 <b>issues</b> 11:22 12:3 96:10	<b>K</b>	<b>looked</b> 5:15 9:9 20:18 33:6 43:25 <b>looking</b> 20:4 28:2 43:3 57:4 57:22 73:25 77:22 98:14 <b>looks</b> 21:5 35:8 56:15 65:5 <b>lord</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2,8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 60:1 60:16,22,24 61:6,13,16,21 62:3,17,23 63:2,8,12 72:1 72:7,9,18 73:6 73:13,23 74:6 77:10,13 79:12 81:16 84:4 93:18 94:22 95:1,10,12 96:2 97:14,19 98:8 99:11,14	<b>J</b>	<b>Los</b> 5:7 8:13 <b>lost</b> 10:13 74:4 <b>lot</b> 5:24,24 6:4,21 10:7 11:8 15:14 37:11,22 44:13 46:1,2 50:18 52:5 70:17 74:7 75:18,22 79:6 82:20 87:20 89:8 94:15,23 <b>lots</b> 20:2 24:22 86:13 <b>loud</b> 26:18 93:15 <b>lovable</b> 91:22 92:5 <b>love</b> 9:15,19 66:15,22 88:10 <b>lovely</b> 82:10 <b>luck</b> 32:14 <b>lucky</b> 16:8 78:25 <b>lucrative</b> 79:22
<b>inquiry</b> 2:3 21:18 23:24 30:25 31:23 33:19 42:16 52:10 53:12 59:17 61:17 70:25 76:18 77:21 80:7 82:15 84:18 93:12 96:20	<b>intrude</b> 91:14	<b>Jefferies</b> 77:6 85:5	<b>keen</b> 93:4,4 <b>keep</b> 75:21 <b>Kent</b> 24:12,20 <b>Kent-ish</b> 24:18 <b>kept</b> 24:24 25:1 25:6 33:20 38:1 64:11	<b>LA</b> 8:21 <b>label</b> 65:15 <b>lady</b> 8:16 <b>language</b> 58:12 75:15 <b>large</b> 88:10 <b>largely</b> 75:22 <b>late</b> 24:14 <b>late-night</b> 8:2 <b>law</b> 82:16 92:22 92:23 <b>laws</b> 72:25 <b>lawsuit</b> 15:15 <b>lawsuits</b> 15:13 <b>lawyer</b> 27:19 32:25,25 39:1 45:20 71:5,14 89:17 <b>lawyers</b> 19:16 20:2 96:20 <b>lawyer's</b> 7:10 <b>lazy</b> 60:20 70:19 74:25 <b>lead</b> 79:9 80:11 <b>leading</b> 27:15,19 48:23 <b>leads</b> 83:23 <b>leak</b> 6:9 37:15,20 39:4 41:1,23 42:14 <b>leaked</b> 43:14,25 <b>leaks</b> 39:12,22 <b>learned</b> 24:2 <b>leave</b> 8:20,24 9:22 18:13 23:1 28:18 31:21 <b>left</b> 26:4 28:20 29:3 53:8 <b>left-field</b> 8:9 <b>left-hand</b> 33:20 34:13 <b>legal</b> 36:22 54:6 90:8 <b>legislate</b> 78:15 <b>length</b> 87:8 <b>lens</b> 24:19 35:9 36:9 44:25 <b>letter</b> 71:18 <b>let's</b> 28:8 39:3 56:1 70:8 <b>level</b> 74:15 <b>Leveson</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2 13:8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 59:17 60:1,16 60:22,24 61:6	<b>libel</b> 7:3,4 8:5 89:18 93:1,4 <b>libelled</b> 84:13 <b>libellous</b> 60:19 <b>licence</b> 90:11,15 93:7 <b>life</b> 3:19,21 9:2 15:10 37:5,6,7 66:15 68:7 71:17 86:4,17 90:22 <b>lifelong</b> 90:10 <b>lift</b> 24:25 25:1 <b>light-hearted</b> 67:13,14 <b>liked</b> 3:13 <b>likes</b> 86:1 <b>limit</b> 96:1 <b>limited</b> 2:13 22:20,21 <b>limiting</b> 29:7 <b>line</b> 58:25 67:16 <b>link</b> 37:13 <b>linked</b> 34:12 <b>list</b> 20:5 89:22 <b>listen</b> 26:22 28:20 31:23 60:14 70:15 <b>listening</b> 6:23 <b>literally</b> 97:21 <b>litigation</b> 10:22 <b>little</b> 3:16 16:17 17:14 19:3 32:24 47:11 51:4 60:12 64:17,25 68:24 69:15 81:12 87:23,25 88:3 91:12 <b>live</b> 88:16 <b>lives</b> 66:23 <b>living</b> 80:2 <b>loathed</b> 52:13 <b>local</b> 59:2 <b>logical</b> 6:8 <b>London</b> 4:24 5:8 38:9 65:11 76:22 <b>long</b> 12:19 13:4,6 14:10 15:13 24:19 25:17 37:8,22 44:25 55:7 76:2 90:2 92:7 93:10 <b>longer</b> 13:22 25:22	<b>looked</b> 5:15 9:9 20:18 33:6 43:25 <b>looking</b> 20:4 28:2 43:3 57:4 57:22 73:25 77:22 98:14 <b>looks</b> 21:5 35:8 56:15 65:5 <b>lord</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2,8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 60:1 60:16,22,24 61:6,13,16,21 62:3,17,23 63:2,8,12 72:1 72:7,9,18 73:6 73:13,23 74:6 77:10,13 79:12 81:16 84:4 93:18 94:22 95:1,10,12 96:2 97:14,19 98:8 99:11,14	<b>M</b>	<b>made</b> 88:15 91:10 <b>Madeleine</b> 77:7 77:10 <b>magazine</b> 43:2 47:17,17 52:25		
<b>instance</b> 18:23 46:20 50:19 52:5 54:15 69:15 72:25 73:19 81:7 87:9 88:9 93:4	<b>invented</b> 49:19 50:21,21 59:10 66:4 69:18	<b>John</b> 1:4,7 99:15	<b>Khan</b> 8:1 <b>kill</b> 72:13 <b>killed</b> 76:23 92:4 <b>kind</b> 5:21 7:1,7 8:11 19:23 23:2 70:21 73:21 75:2 81:6 84:19	<b>LA</b> 8:21 <b>label</b> 65:15 <b>lady</b> 8:16 <b>language</b> 58:12 75:15 <b>large</b> 88:10 <b>largely</b> 75:22 <b>late</b> 24:14 <b>late-night</b> 8:2 <b>law</b> 82:16 92:22 92:23 <b>laws</b> 72:25 <b>lawsuit</b> 15:15 <b>lawsuits</b> 15:13 <b>lawyer</b> 27:19 32:25,25 39:1 45:20 71:5,14 89:17 <b>lawyers</b> 19:16 20:2 96:20 <b>lawyer's</b> 7:10 <b>lazy</b> 60:20 70:19 74:25 <b>lead</b> 79:9 80:11 <b>leading</b> 27:15,19 48:23 <b>leads</b> 83:23 <b>leak</b> 6:9 37:15,20 39:4 41:1,23 42:14 <b>leaked</b> 43:14,25 <b>leaks</b> 39:12,22 <b>learned</b> 24:2 <b>leave</b> 8:20,24 9:22 18:13 23:1 28:18 31:21 <b>left</b> 26:4 28:20 29:3 53:8 <b>left-field</b> 8:9 <b>left-hand</b> 33:20 34:13 <b>legal</b> 36:22 54:6 90:8 <b>legislate</b> 78:15 <b>length</b> 87:8 <b>lens</b> 24:19 35:9 36:9 44:25 <b>letter</b> 71:18 <b>let's</b> 28:8 39:3 56:1 70:8 <b>level</b> 74:15 <b>Leveson</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2 13:8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 59:17 60:1,16 60:22,24 61:6	<b>lifelong</b> 90:10 <b>lift</b> 24:25 25:1 <b>light-hearted</b> 67:13,14 <b>liked</b> 3:13 <b>likes</b> 86:1 <b>limit</b> 96:1 <b>limited</b> 2:13 22:20,21 <b>limiting</b> 29:7 <b>line</b> 58:25 67:16 <b>link</b> 37:13 <b>linked</b> 34:12 <b>list</b> 20:5 89:22 <b>listen</b> 26:22 28:20 31:23 60:14 70:15 <b>listening</b> 6:23 <b>literally</b> 97:21 <b>litigation</b> 10:22 <b>little</b> 3:16 16:17 17:14 19:3 32:24 47:11 51:4 60:12 64:17,25 68:24 69:15 81:12 87:23,25 88:3 91:12 <b>live</b> 88:16 <b>lives</b> 66:23 <b>living</b> 80:2 <b>loathed</b> 52:13 <b>local</b> 59:2 <b>logical</b> 6:8 <b>London</b> 4:24 5:8 38:9 65:11 76:22 <b>long</b> 12:19 13:4,6 14:10 15:13 24:19 25:17 37:8,22 44:25 55:7 76:2 90:2 92:7 93:10 <b>longer</b> 13:22 25:22	<b>looked</b> 5:15 9:9 20:18 33:6 43:25 <b>looking</b> 20:4 28:2 43:3 57:4 57:22 73:25 77:22 98:14 <b>looks</b> 21:5 35:8 56:15 65:5 <b>lord</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2,8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 60:1 60:16,22,24 61:6,13,16,21 62:3,17,23 63:2,8,12 72:1 72:7,9,18 73:6 73:13,23 74:6 77:10,13 79:12 81:16 84:4 93:18 94:22 95:1,10,12 96:2 97:14,19 98:8 99:11,14	<b>M</b>	<b>made</b> 88:15 91:10 <b>Madeleine</b> 77:7 77:10 <b>magazine</b> 43:2 47:17,17 52:25		
<b>instantly</b> 60:8	<b>invited</b> 95:21	<b>John</b> 1:4,7 99:15	<b>kill</b> 72:13 <b>killed</b> 76:23 92:4 <b>kind</b> 5:21 7:1,7 8:11 19:23 23:2 70:21 73:21 75:2 81:6 84:19	<b>LA</b> 8:21 <b>label</b> 65:15 <b>lady</b> 8:16 <b>language</b> 58:12 75:15 <b>large</b> 88:10 <b>largely</b> 75:22 <b>late</b> 24:14 <b>late-night</b> 8:2 <b>law</b> 82:16 92:22 92:23 <b>laws</b> 72:25 <b>lawsuit</b> 15:15 <b>lawsuits</b> 15:13 <b>lawyer</b> 27:19 32:25,25 39:1 45:20 71:5,14 89:17 <b>lawyers</b> 19:16 20:2 96:20 <b>lawyer's</b> 7:10 <b>lazy</b> 60:20 70:19 74:25 <b>lead</b> 79:9 80:11 <b>leading</b> 27:15,19 48:23 <b>leads</b> 83:23 <b>leak</b> 6:9 37:15,20 39:4 41:1,23 42:14 <b>leaked</b> 43:14,25 <b>leaks</b> 39:12,22 <b>learned</b> 24:2 <b>leave</b> 8:20,24 9:22 18:13 23:1 28:18 31:21 <b>left</b> 26:4 28:20 29:3 53:8 <b>left-field</b> 8:9 <b>left-hand</b> 33:20 34:13 <b>legal</b> 36:22 54:6 90:8 <b>legislate</b> 78:15 <b>length</b> 87:8 <b>lens</b> 24:19 35:9 36:9 44:25 <b>letter</b> 71:18 <b>let's</b> 28:8 39:3 56:1 70:8 <b>level</b> 74:15 <b>Leveson</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2 13:8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 59:17 60:1,16 60:22,24 61:6	<b>lifelong</b> 90:10 <b>lift</b> 24:25 25:1 <b>light-hearted</b> 67:13,14 <b>liked</b> 3:13 <b>likes</b> 86:1 <b>limit</b> 96:1 <b>limited</b> 2:13 22:20,21 <b>limiting</b> 29:7 <b>line</b> 58:25 67:16 <b>link</b> 37:13 <b>linked</b> 34:12 <b>list</b> 20:5 89:22 <b>listen</b> 26:22 28:20 31:23 60:14 70:15 <b>listening</b> 6:23 <b>literally</b> 97:21 <b>litigation</b> 10:22 <b>little</b> 3:16 16:17 17:14 19:3 32:24 47:11 51:4 60:12 64:17,25 68:24 69:15 81:12 87:23,25 88:3 91:12 <b>live</b> 88:16 <b>lives</b> 66:23 <b>living</b> 80:2 <b>loathed</b> 52:13 <b>local</b> 59:2 <b>logical</b> 6:8 <b>London</b> 4:24 5:8 38:9 65:11 76:22 <b>long</b> 12:19 13:4,6 14:10 15:13 24:19 25:17 37:8,22 44:25 55:7 76:2 90:2 92:7 93:10 <b>longer</b> 13:22 25:22	<b>looked</b> 5:15 9:9 20:18 33:6 43:25 <b>looking</b> 20:4 28:2 43:3 57:4 57:22 73:25 77:22 98:14 <b>looks</b> 21:5 35:8 56:15 65:5 <b>lord</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2,8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 60:1 60:16,22,24 61:6,13,16,21 62:3,17,23 63:2,8,12 72:1 72:7,9,18 73:6 73:13,23 74:6 77:10,13 79:12 81:16 84:4 93:18 94:22 95:1,10,12 96:2 97:14,19 98:8 99:11,14	<b>M</b>	<b>made</b> 88:15 91:10 <b>Madeleine</b> 77:7 77:10 <b>magazine</b> 43:2 47:17,17 52:25		
<b>instinct</b> 94:7	<b>involved</b> 27:22 28:4 29:16 30:9 38:24 46:7,16,17	<b>John</b> 1:4,7 99:15	<b>kill</b> 72:13 <b>killed</b> 76:23 92:4 <b>kind</b> 5:21 7:1,7 8:11 19:23 23:2 70:21 73:21 75:2 81:6 84:19	<b>LA</b> 8:21 <b>label</b> 65:15 <b>lady</b> 8:16 <b>language</b> 58:12 75:15 <b>large</b> 88:10 <b>largely</b> 75:22 <b>late</b> 24:14 <b>late-night</b> 8:2 <b>law</b> 82:16 92:22 92:23 <b>laws</b> 72:25 <b>lawsuit</b> 15:15 <b>lawsuits</b> 15:13 <b>lawyer</b> 27:19 32:25,25 39:1 45:20 71:5,14 89:17 <b>lawyers</b> 19:16 20:2 96:20 <b>lawyer's</b> 7:10 <b>lazy</b> 60:20 70:19 74:25 <b>lead</b> 79:9 80:11 <b>leading</b> 27:15,19 48:23 <b>leads</b> 83:23 <b>leak</b> 6:9 37:15,20 39:4 41:1,23 42:14 <b>leaked</b> 43:14,25 <b>leaks</b> 39:12,22 <b>learned</b> 24:2 <b>leave</b> 8:20,24 9:22 18:13 23:1 28:18 31:21 <b>left</b> 26:4 28:20 29:3 53:8 <b>left-field</b> 8:9 <b>left-hand</b> 33:20 34:13 <b>legal</b> 36:22 54:6 90:8 <b>legislate</b> 78:15 <b>length</b> 87:8 <b>lens</b> 24:19 35:9 36:9 44:25 <b>letter</b> 71:18 <b>let's</b> 28:8 39:3 56:1 70:8 <b>level</b> 74:15 <b>Leveson</b> 1:20,22 2:11 6:17 13:2 13:8,11 14:2 16:9 19:8 21:12 23:6,13 23:16 31:4,7,9 31:12 32:4 34:7,9 35:24 36:3,6 53:4,10 53:22,25 54:11 55:1,4,6 56:1,5 56:7 58:7 59:17 60:1,16 60:22,24 61:6	<b>lifelong</b> 90:10 <b>lift</b> 24:25 25:1 <b>light-hearted</b> 67:13,14 <b>liked</b> 3:13 <b>likes</b> 86:1 <b>limit</b> 96:1 <b>limited</b> 2:13 22:20,21 <b>limiting</b> 2					

59:3 70:1 90:9	26:16 50:8	<b>misreporting</b>	<b>muzzles</b> 82:17,22	83:2 88:11	92:2	<b>order</b> 6:9 23:10
<b>Mail</b> 7:24 9:3	51:12 61:10	50:18 55:21	<b>muzzling</b> 78:17	90:9 98:5	<b>obvious</b> 66:20	34:15 43:16
19:5 27:14,22	66:24 67:5	60:20 75:22,24	<b>mystery</b> 34:18	<b>newspapers</b> 16:3	78:23 97:18	98:10
28:4,12,13,22	69:8 70:22	<b>misrepresent</b>	34:20	18:6 44:6	<b>obviously</b> 22:25	<b>organs</b> 50:6 69:8
29:1,15 30:1	77:10 81:25	51:9	<b>myth</b> 77:17	49:25 51:10,15	35:20 62:21	<b>original</b> 69:19
30:12,20 33:17	90:24 93:13	<b>mistaken</b> 62:12	78:10 79:8,13	51:17 62:8	64:20 70:25	<b>originally</b> 44:8
34:2,3,19	<b>meaningful</b> 81:2	<b>Mm</b> 7:21 10:18	82:16 83:23	71:19 79:21	73:8 78:1	45:6
37:24 42:11,23	81:5,14 84:12	10:21 48:22	84:6 86:25	86:6 88:3,3	81:19 95:19	<b>ought</b> 23:6 28:15
44:13,15,18,19	<b>means</b> 79:15,24	56:13 58:13	87:4,9 89:3,16	<b>news-gathering</b>	96:20	32:4 58:7
45:1 49:24	84:16,25	62:2	89:24 91:22	62:10 68:9	<b>occasion</b> 6:1	<b>outside</b> 6:21
51:19 52:22	<b>meant</b> 77:10	<b>Mm-hm</b> 66:19	<b>myths</b> 76:8,9	<b>nice</b> 8:21 14:19	67:13	11:24 12:21
55:16 69:1,2	<b>measures</b> 96:18	70:9 75:17		24:18 42:9	<b>occasionally</b>	47:1 62:21
74:8 87:10	<b>mechanisms</b>	<b>mobile</b> 9:4	<b>N</b>	51:14	18:10	71:20
<b>Mail's</b> 9:19,19	19:9	<b>model</b> 79:22	<b>N</b> 99:2	<b>night</b> 5:9	<b>occurrence</b>	<b>overspeaking</b>
<b>main</b> 60:5 67:14	<b>media</b> 19:16 20:2	<b>modicum</b> 18:11	<b>naive</b> 51:10	<b>nine</b> 86:25	17:15	84:1
94:14	37:2 88:4	<b>moment</b> 5:17	<b>name</b> 1:6 23:21	<b>nodded</b> 5:21	<b>October</b> 42:20	<b>overwhelming</b>
<b>maintain</b> 96:15	98:11	26:11 39:2	37:19 38:1	<b>noise</b> 91:4	54:7	36:24
<b>majority</b> 83:1	<b>medical</b> 12:14,24	53:3 72:2,3,19	42:13 66:11	<b>non-journalists</b>	<b>odd</b> 30:3,5	<b>over-regulation</b>
86:3	14:24 16:2,20	90:3 95:13	86:16,18,19	80:24	<b>offered</b> 46:11	79:9
<b>making</b> 3:13	16:23 71:12	<b>moments</b> 52:1	89:21	<b>non-medical</b>	86:5	<b>o'clock</b> 95:22
68:20 71:17	<b>medicine</b> 82:7	<b>money</b> 6:19	<b>named</b> 98:5	16:15	<b>offering</b> 15:15	98:24
89:18 94:23	<b>meeting</b> 20:19	30:17 64:7	<b>names</b> 31:2,2	<b>normal</b> 6:5 71:21	<b>office</b> 20:10 21:9	
<b>maligned</b> 85:6	26:20 32:24	68:19,20,21	33:12 98:12,13	<b>note</b> 27:10	23:23 89:6,15	<b>P</b>
<b>man</b> 14:8 22:7	<b>memory</b> 33:15	86:21 87:21	<b>nasty</b> 51:15,22	<b>notebook</b> 20:23	<b>officers</b> 21:13,16	<b>PA</b> 65:16
24:19 25:3	<b>menaced</b> 46:3,6	89:10,19	<b>nation</b> 3:12	21:6	32:20	<b>pact</b> 87:1 90:5
38:22 45:24	<b>mention</b> 7:13	<b>monitoring</b> 72:3	<b>national</b> 18:6	<b>notebooks</b> 22:3,4	<b>office's</b> 21:24	<b>pact</b> 10:2 13:22
59:9 85:5	34:3 89:21	<b>monster</b> 49:8	61:3 72:15	<b>noted</b> 11:20	<b>official</b> 20:13	13:23 25:22
86:12,20	<b>mentioned</b> 23:21	87:24	<b>natural</b> 66:23	<b>Notice</b> 66:12	<b>oh</b> 5:22 14:20	26:9 33:5,24
<b>managed</b> 5:8	34:3 83:25	<b>monstered</b> 77:6	<b>nature</b> 75:19	<b>notion</b> 51:10	28:9,23 29:14	35:6 57:5 59:6
53:20	<b>mercy</b> 18:21	<b>months</b> 11:9,9	<b>naughty</b> 92:1,5	<b>notwithstanding</b>	37:4 46:10	<b>papers</b> 33:3 35:15
<b>Manchester</b>	<b>merely</b> 43:25	13:7 19:7	<b>necessarily</b>	74:13	59:18 86:6	35:17
86:13	60:19 61:3,21	37:12 52:16	23:17	<b>noun</b> 45:5	89:24 90:20	<b>paid</b> 25:13 51:19
<b>man's</b> 84:6	<b>messages</b> 8:21,24	54:10	<b>necessary</b> 26:21	<b>November</b> 1:11	<b>okay</b> 4:1 9:14,22	52:2 95:7
<b>March</b> 13:15	9:4 33:11	<b>moral</b> 87:20	32:8	1:16 54:18,19	11:19 14:3,16	<b>pair</b> 86:10
<b>market</b> 72:14	<b>metaphor</b> 78:18	<b>morning</b> 62:1	<b>need</b> 21:23 81:3	56:11 57:12	27:10 28:8	<b>palm</b> 56:18
73:7	<b>method</b> 5:22	86:15	86:2 87:5,9	95:16	29:17 38:14	<b>panel</b> 80:23
<b>marketed</b> 87:13	<b>methods</b> 68:9	<b>mother</b> 18:13	95:6 96:4 98:3	<b>no-win</b> 47:19	41:11 47:6,10	<b>pap</b> 24:21 46:25
<b>Marmite</b> 8:23	<b>Metropolitan</b>	36:25 39:3	<b>needed</b> 38:7	<b>number</b> 10:3	58:13 59:25	<b>paparazzi</b> 17:11
<b>married</b> 8:15	34:15 40:14	41:24 42:2	<b>needs</b> 55:7 70:25	11:22 13:22,23	63:14 64:24	18:2,4,7,16,20
<b>marry</b> 50:3	97:16	45:18,23 46:12	94:15 96:8,24	16:10 20:24	65:16 69:25	37:11 40:20
<b>massive</b> 64:20	<b>microcosm</b>	48:6,19 49:16	<b>neither</b> 49:16	25:23 27:1	70:8 71:24	45:19 59:8
71:12	68:25	50:14 51:18	<b>neutral</b> 67:19	33:10 35:13	75:1 76:3,10	71:16 72:5,6,7
<b>material</b> 32:7	<b>middle</b> 6:22	53:8 70:22	<b>never</b> 6:6 8:17	38:20 40:3	85:14 86:23,24	72:15
75:18	24:20,21 33:7	71:17	19:6 21:25	84:6 86:25	90:3 93:25	<b>paparazzo</b> 45:4
<b>matter</b> 14:5	59:2 80:9	<b>mother's</b> 51:3	68:19 69:18	<b>numbering</b> 10:2	94:21	54:16
15:21 30:18	<b>middle-aged</b>	<b>motivated</b> 4:15	82:18 86:18	10:2 13:22	<b>old</b> 9:8	<b>paper</b> 33:18
37:3 46:12	8:16	<b>motive</b> 36:24	89:21	25:22	<b>once</b> 12:8 63:21	35:12 52:25
49:16 53:8	<b>midways</b> 82:2	68:18	<b>nevertheless</b>	<b>numbers</b> 19:18	68:12 69:6	81:11 83:5,5
55:11 60:10	<b>mightn't</b> 44:3	<b>move</b> 2:19 4:3	5:13	20:7 21:2	70:4 91:8,20	90:1 91:2
61:12 86:22	<b>milk</b> 91:6,8,9	17:11 19:13	<b>new</b> 18:12 25:21	22:11,12,23	<b>ones</b> 18:9,22,25	<b>papers</b> 5:16 10:7
90:12,14,16	<b>mind</b> 17:10	34:22 54:12	31:16 43:9	33:7,9,9,13	19:4	18:10 19:5
95:23 98:18	31:21 39:20	63:14	51:17,18 57:15	<b>nun</b> 86:1	<b>one's</b> 47:5 82:24	47:17 48:1
<b>matters</b> 1:24	41:16 70:15	<b>moved</b> 44:12	57:19 58:10	<b>nutshell</b> 15:25	<b>one-off</b> 3:2	49:2,18 52:6
12:20,21 47:11	76:13 94:1	<b>moving</b> 38:12	60:8 63:25	92:16	<b>online</b> 15:18	59:22 60:2
51:6 53:15	<b>mine</b> 8:13 33:7	<b>MP</b> 5:20	69:19 81:10		<b>open</b> 8:7 10:15	72:16 76:16
63:16	49:8 51:13	<b>MPs</b> 92:9	<b>news</b> 25:10 26:12	<b>O</b>	<b>Operation</b> 32:20	87:5 88:13
<b>Maurice</b> 3:1	<b>minor</b> 87:18	<b>mugged</b> 41:8	27:13 28:11,21	<b>oath</b> 59:13	<b>opinion</b> 2:17	89:19,25 90:20
<b>McCann</b> 77:7	<b>minutes</b> 2:7 55:7	<b>mugging</b> 40:5	28:25 34:1,12	<b>obedience</b> 85:12	17:5 28:2	<b>paps</b> 22:8
<b>McMullan</b> 24:5	<b>Mirror</b> 11:2	<b>Mulcaire</b> 21:10	34:17 35:6	<b>objection</b> 74:13	39:21 52:7	<b>paragraph</b> 4:4
<b>McMullen</b> 27:1	33:16 34:2,19	21:11 22:3,5	42:24 44:10,11	<b>objections</b> 87:6	63:16 70:24	7:2,17,24 9:24
27:7 29:18,21	53:17 54:2	33:20	44:18,22,25	<b>obligation</b> 87:18	73:17,17 76:6	10:23 11:21
32:3,13,17	55:16 87:10	<b>Mungo</b> 1:4,7	45:6 58:16	87:20	76:6 77:19	12:23 13:13
78:1	91:21	99:15	69:14 70:8	<b>obtain</b> 22:16	78:14 82:15	17:11,12 19:15
<b>McMullen's</b> 28:7	<b>miserable</b> 71:17	<b>Murat</b> 77:7	77:19 85:2	53:20 66:24	83:19 84:22	20:9 24:6
40:12	<b>misquoted</b> 88:6	<b>murder</b> 85:6	<b>newspaper</b> 11:11	<b>obtained</b> 44:2	<b>opinions</b> 2:19	32:19 38:15
<b>mean</b> 9:15 11:8	<b>misreported</b>	<b>murdered</b> 92:3	17:2 62:8,13	67:6 68:16	<b>opportunity</b> 76:4	39:18 45:11
19:22 20:19	60:7	<b>muzzler</b> 93:6	70:1 72:12	69:3,5 70:2	81:23 82:15	53:17 54:9

55:13 56:1,3,3 76:7 92:14,16 <b>paragraphs</b> 17:8 90:5 <b>pardon</b> 56:6 <b>parents</b> 14:21 42:5 52:23 77:11 <b>park</b> 23:1 <b>Parliament</b> 84:23 <b>part</b> 3:7,8 9:12 12:9 23:13 52:19 61:17 65:18 88:20 <b>participants</b> 96:20 <b>particular</b> 5:22 6:9 7:15 21:17 26:8 31:2 33:15,21,24,25 37:11 41:2 44:11 49:25 52:13 59:15 61:14 <b>particularly</b> 3:23 14:11 19:5 38:15 47:21 52:7 55:22 62:7 64:6 69:25 74:11 76:20 80:9 88:19 98:21 <b>partly</b> 80:23,24 <b>parts</b> 23:10 75:24 <b>pass</b> 93:10 <b>passionate</b> 59:11 <b>pasted</b> 10:10 66:4 <b>patch</b> 66:4 <b>patched</b> 10:10 <b>PATRY</b> 99:10 <b>Paul</b> 24:4 27:1,7 28:6 40:11 <b>pay</b> 15:16,19 64:7,10 95:7 <b>payers</b> 28:10,24 <b>paying</b> 15:6,6 40:13 52:17 72:16,21 81:12 <b>Payne</b> 85:7 <b>PCC</b> 11:6,14 12:7,16,16,17 71:7,10,19 72:3 81:8 92:24 <b>penny</b> 9:10 15:19 <b>people</b> 5:23 15:24 20:24 31:2 33:12,13 38:10 40:21 43:9 45:22 47:3 52:7,14 59:16 66:14,22 67:11 73:3,17 76:20 77:3,5	78:23 79:6 81:14,17 82:4 84:21,24 85:9 87:3,5,21,24 88:5 89:22 92:25 93:20 97:7 <b>people's</b> 40:16 66:22 86:4 <b>perfectly</b> 31:5 75:25 <b>Permission</b> 84:3 <b>persistent</b> 8:2 <b>person</b> 8:17 21:5 21:22 24:18 28:12 29:11 84:15 91:3 92:18 <b>personal</b> 20:23 27:22 <b>personally</b> 89:17 93:6 <b>person's</b> 91:18 <b>perspective</b> 73:9 81:18 <b>persuaded</b> 75:10 <b>petrol</b> 18:1 <b>phenomenon</b> 40:19 <b>phone</b> 7:23 8:19 9:21 19:18 21:1,25 22:11 25:9 27:4 28:4 29:16 30:9,19 32:23 33:6,10 33:11,22 38:18 38:20 42:10 43:10 48:9 77:1 85:2 92:3 <b>phonecalls</b> 8:3 <b>phoned</b> 65:9,10 <b>phones</b> 20:8 <b>phone-hacked</b> 30:1,4,12 <b>photograph</b> 14:19 28:16 56:16,19 <b>photographer</b> 40:7 <b>photographers</b> 18:9 41:9 44:23 <b>photographs</b> 29:8,10 30:8 35:8 36:10,15 44:17,19 45:5 <b>phrase</b> 23:4 <b>picture</b> 16:14,17 17:2 19:2 28:12,14 29:11 45:24 56:14 57:16,20 61:19 61:21 62:4 63:17 73:1,14 95:3 <b>pictured</b> 59:6 <b>pictures</b> 18:3,5	18:22 19:1,6 24:22 44:21,23 44:24,24 45:3 45:21 46:1 51:20 57:2,19 72:14,16,21,23 73:4 <b>piece</b> 9:12 15:8,9 22:15 25:20 35:11 36:14 43:14 49:23 52:19 58:14 61:11 64:25 74:13 83:3,11 83:14 98:15 <b>pieces</b> 33:18 50:1 50:10 74:20 <b>PIN</b> 20:7 22:12 22:23 33:8 <b>PINs</b> 19:19 <b>pint</b> 91:6 <b>piss</b> 94:8 <b>place</b> 21:20 54:18 68:19 73:1 <b>places</b> 78:9 <b>plan</b> 42:2,5 <b>planned</b> 48:20 49:4 <b>Platell</b> 49:24 52:11 74:9 <b>platform</b> 85:23 <b>plays</b> 73:13 <b>please</b> 1:3,6,9,12 2:18 3:9 7:4 8:25 18:3 32:24 34:22 35:2 55:13 65:3 78:12 79:10 80:15 85:20 89:19 93:25 <b>pleased</b> 2:9 <b>plummeted</b> 3:6 <b>plummy</b> 9:1 <b>plummy-voiced</b> 7:20 8:3,10 28:6 <b>pm</b> 1:2 55:8,10 98:23 <b>pockets</b> 74:1 <b>point</b> 4:11,21 10:1,15 15:21 15:22,25 26:18 36:9 37:16 41:6 47:19 59:23 60:22,24 61:4 67:7 69:2 70:6 74:12 75:15,21 76:13 78:11 79:8,19 82:18,23 83:9 83:24 85:14,15 90:5 91:11,22 93:23,24 <b>points</b> 76:10 77:21 93:21	96:3 97:15 <b>police</b> 5:13,19 6:9 18:16 21:16 25:13 27:3,3 31:5 32:25 33:18,23 34:16 38:24 39:1,5,8,8,12 39:14,15,22 40:5,13,14 41:2,9 46:7,8 46:11,16,17,23 54:13 92:8 97:16 <b>policeman</b> 20:12 20:16 40:9,21 <b>polite</b> 24:22 <b>politician</b> 85:22 <b>politicians</b> 76:15 <b>popular</b> 3:13 49:12 76:16 94:4 <b>port</b> 93:1 <b>Portland</b> 52:3,18 <b>position</b> 21:24 32:15 51:6,7 60:2 77:23 85:17 98:11 <b>positions</b> 93:16 <b>positive</b> 3:16 71:10 79:10 80:15 89:9 92:12 <b>possibilities</b> 6:8 <b>possible</b> 12:5 22:23 44:4 46:21 47:25 52:14 53:19 60:16 75:3 96:23 <b>possibly</b> 8:8 34:21 38:7 45:20 88:25 90:16 93:5 <b>potential</b> 31:10 <b>Potentially</b> 45:14 <b>power</b> 94:6 <b>PR</b> 38:9 <b>practice</b> 32:9 <b>practices</b> 61:23 78:16 98:14 <b>practise</b> 78:6,8 <b>precisely</b> 10:15 61:17 <b>precision</b> 68:24 <b>prefer</b> 1:25 46:20 <b>pregnancy</b> 37:12 44:9 49:5 <b>pregnant</b> 37:10 48:6 49:3 <b>prejudice</b> 31:9 <b>premiere</b> 3:23 4:1 <b>prepared</b> 1:8 11:15 <b>preparing</b> 9:7	<b>present</b> 41:22 96:21 <b>presentation</b> 68:2 <b>press</b> 1:25 3:6,16 3:24 4:14,18 4:18 5:6,25 6:11,21 7:8 9:9 18:9 21:7 32:10 37:1 39:5,12,14,15 39:22 40:15 41:2,20,24 50:6 51:2,7 52:12 55:21 61:22 62:18,24 64:15,16 65:19 65:20,23,25 66:3 67:10,11 67:23 68:13 69:9 70:5 72:4 75:6 77:6,7 79:11,15 82:3 82:8,17,21,22 83:22 85:6,11 85:12 87:4 89:9 91:1,2,13 93:7 94:9,12 <b>pressure</b> 37:22 37:23 <b>presumably</b> 18:7 73:4 <b>pretty</b> 14:20 66:20 <b>previous</b> 10:10 18:19 33:2 76:5 <b>Princess</b> 19:4 <b>print</b> 37:13 38:2 38:5 51:25 94:4 <b>printed</b> 12:14 <b>prior</b> 67:15 <b>prison</b> 27:7 32:3 <b>privacy</b> 10:20 11:20 14:18,21 15:1,23 17:9 19:17 36:22 50:6 51:5,22 52:2,4 68:22 77:3,18 79:25 82:16,18,24 84:6,13 87:3,6 90:23 91:15,19 92:18,22 93:1 93:8 <b>privacy-stealing</b> 92:21 <b>private</b> 3:18,21 20:22,22 21:19 49:16 51:19 68:7 86:17 90:22 <b>proactive</b> 36:21 <b>probably</b> 2:22 4:1 11:1 14:5 16:9 30:23	39:3 61:16 66:16 67:7 68:8,23 72:13 76:3,14 <b>problem</b> 26:24 26:25 35:25 63:9 70:14 <b>problems</b> 60:6 73:6 <b>proceedings</b> 36:22 45:10 71:3 <b>process</b> 84:15 98:17 <b>production</b> 8:14 <b>professionalism</b> 62:11 <b>professionally</b> 5:2 62:24 <b>professors</b> 75:4 80:25 <b>profit</b> 12:15 16:3 68:19,20 79:25 83:13 93:8 <b>profound</b> 82:4 <b>project</b> 91:5 <b>promised</b> 19:6 <b>proper</b> 51:24 78:18 81:1 84:9,18 92:24 <b>proposals</b> 79:10 92:12 <b>propose</b> 96:15 <b>proposition</b> 23:18 <b>prosecute</b> 85:4 <b>prosecution</b> 31:10 <b>prostitute</b> 86:20 89:8 <b>prostitutes</b> 86:1 <b>protect</b> 19:17 36:21,25 70:22 79:21 92:20,25 93:2 94:7 98:10 <b>protected</b> 93:5 <b>protecting</b> 49:6,7 <b>Protection</b> 22:17 22:21 <b>protesting</b> 15:20 <b>protocol</b> 95:20 95:24 96:6 97:8,17 <b>provide</b> 10:20 42:16,19 <b>provided</b> 45:5 56:11,22 <b>provides</b> 72:3 <b>providing</b> 50:13 <b>prurience</b> 66:23 <b>pub</b> 25:5 <b>public</b> 4:17 9:5 15:23 16:2 31:17 32:8 37:3 40:21 68:7,12,13,20	69:7,7,10,24 70:4,4 73:1,3 82:25 83:4,6 83:10,11 85:16 85:22,24 86:4 86:5,16 88:22 89:22 92:19 97:1 <b>publicist</b> 47:12 48:15 63:21 64:6 65:1,6,9 65:14 <b>publicists</b> 63:19 63:24 <b>publicist's</b> 48:7 <b>publicity</b> 43:8 63:19 64:3 73:19,21 87:17 87:23 <b>publicly</b> 47:8 <b>publish</b> 42:23 43:6,18,21,24 44:20 69:1 90:11 96:22 <b>published</b> 12:25 31:16 36:14 43:25 44:19 45:1 47:18 57:14 <b>publishing</b> 43:11 <b>pull</b> 14:8 <b>pulled</b> 18:1,2 24:16 <b>purchased</b> 45:3 <b>purported</b> 10:5 <b>purpose</b> 54:21 <b>pushed</b> 85:11 <b>put</b> 9:11,17 13:20 21:23 26:4 37:22 46:25 47:12 50:1,12 51:22 52:5 60:25 69:21 75:13 87:20 88:12 89:3 95:22 96:25 <b>putting</b> 15:24 23:19 48:23 59:23 92:7
					<b>Q</b>	
					<b>quarrel</b> 4:19 61:11 <b>question</b> 23:17 27:11,15 28:1 28:7 29:17 30:3,5 38:16 48:5 61:22,25 62:16,17 63:2 65:3 66:5,13 68:23 72:18,19 73:15 83:2 94:11 <b>questioning</b> 4:12 47:5 <b>questions</b> 1:5	

12:6,8,9 27:20 63:18 95:4 98:15 99:6,7,8 99:10,11,13,14 99:16 <b>queue</b> 14:9 <b>quick</b> 42:7 <b>quid</b> 17:3,4 <b>quite</b> 17:4,17 25:25 26:18 30:23 33:3 34:23 38:12 39:24 43:5 65:7 66:16 68:6 69:23 72:16 73:18 74:2,7 75:14 75:18 76:16 83:18,20 86:8 87:18 88:21 90:20 98:11 <b>quotations</b> 10:11 <b>quote</b> 67:9	47:7 54:21 57:18 63:12 97:18 <b>recall</b> 10:13 15:9 <b>receive</b> 59:24 <b>received</b> 97:15 <b>recipient</b> 19:25 <b>recognise</b> 33:6 <b>recognised</b> 33:12 <b>recognition</b> 11:10 <b>recollection</b> 13:7 22:2 54:3 <b>commendati...</b> 61:1,8 <b>record</b> 4:17 14:24 37:3 94:17 <b>recorded</b> 40:12 <b>recorder</b> 25:15 25:18 <b>recording</b> 26:3 26:18 <b>records</b> 12:14 16:2 18:18 71:12 <b>recruited</b> 18:17 <b>redact</b> 33:19 <b>redacted</b> 34:13 96:24 98:6 <b>refer</b> 9:24 55:15 55:23 <b>referenced</b> 52:10 <b>referred</b> 29:15 30:4 54:13 63:21 <b>referring</b> 9:18 11:13 35:18 68:1 <b>refers</b> 53:17 54:8 <b>reflected</b> 53:7 <b>reflects</b> 14:12 <b>reform</b> 93:4 <b>refused</b> 15:19 27:6 84:4 <b>regard</b> 97:6 <b>regards</b> 97:7 <b>register</b> 16:22 <b>regretted</b> 12:2 <b>regulate</b> 72:22 78:15 79:15 <b>regulated</b> 82:5,7 <b>regulating</b> 74:20 <b>regulation</b> 61:22 79:11 80:4,11 80:19,22 81:6 82:9 <b>regulator</b> 81:10 84:10,12,14,18 92:24 <b>regulators</b> 82:8 <b>related</b> 79:8 83:24 <b>relates</b> 35:5 66:8 <b>relating</b> 21:25 54:16 <b>relation</b> 2:21	9:13 42:16 53:16 62:19 64:14,16,24 65:19 68:25 69:2 71:7 74:11 77:25 79:11 97:16 98:3,5,10 <b>relations</b> 21:1 <b>relationship</b> 8:1 8:12 49:19 <b>relatively</b> 17:15 <b>relax</b> 95:13 <b>released</b> 88:11 <b>relevant</b> 21:22 69:3 75:12 <b>relief</b> 53:6,7 <b>reluctant</b> 11:9 41:22 75:7 <b>remains</b> 67:5 <b>remarkable</b> 54:23 <b>remember</b> 4:1 5:9,16,18 13:5 19:20 20:4,4 20:12 21:1 23:5 26:15 41:8 46:14,15 66:9,11 <b>remind</b> 54:15 <b>remit</b> 11:25 12:7 12:15,16,22 <b>remotely</b> 33:11 <b>remotest</b> 24:12 <b>remove</b> 19:1 <b>renewed</b> 84:5 <b>repeat</b> 98:20 <b>report</b> 51:11 54:13 59:2,3 84:24 <b>reported</b> 51:23 60:2 <b>reporter</b> 40:8 <b>reporters</b> 40:20 71:16 <b>reporting</b> 60:20 74:25 <b>reports</b> 58:23 <b>representing</b> 44:15 <b>represents</b> 9:16 <b>reputation</b> 49:6 62:19 86:7 <b>require</b> 96:18 <b>resist</b> 42:7 92:21 <b>resolve</b> 12:8 <b>resolved</b> 12:8 <b>resolving</b> 12:3 <b>respond</b> 23:14 <b>response</b> 49:22 <b>responsible</b> 88:13 <b>rest</b> 30:22 66:3 74:2 <b>restrict</b> 85:10 <b>result</b> 53:12 <b>resulted</b> 54:7	<b>retainer</b> 17:1 <b>retired</b> 25:5 <b>retrospect</b> 39:3 <b>return</b> 95:12 <b>returned</b> 36:19 36:20 <b>revealed</b> 25:3 <b>revenge</b> 27:1 <b>reverse</b> 93:6 <b>review</b> 95:18 <b>rich</b> 84:6 <b>rid</b> 71:15 <b>right</b> 6:24 10:12 11:12,19 15:7 16:19 19:25 22:1 25:18,19 31:15 35:9 40:24 42:25 44:16 45:3 46:10,23 47:3 47:14 51:25 53:4 54:11 57:14 58:25 63:22 65:12,17 65:22 68:10,14 69:13 72:8,13 72:24 73:23 74:1,21,22 81:5,13,16 83:16 87:15 90:14,23 91:18 92:18 95:10,13 98:2 <b>rightly</b> 12:4 39:3 43:5 65:5,7 68:6 69:23 83:19 <b>rights</b> 79:25 82:17 91:17 92:23 95:17 <b>right-hand</b> 10:3 13:23 <b>ring</b> 33:10 <b>rings</b> 8:17,17 <b>Rio</b> 83:17 84:2 <b>rise</b> 41:1 53:14 <b>risking</b> 78:10 <b>road</b> 46:5 <b>Robert</b> 77:7 <b>rocket</b> 92:20 <b>rocks</b> 8:2 <b>rogue</b> 72:15 91:22 <b>role</b> 65:18 <b>romance</b> 17:24 <b>room</b> 96:20 <b>round</b> 59:15 60:9 <b>rows</b> 6:25 <b>rule</b> 83:18 <b>ruling</b> 95:16,18 96:7 98:9 <b>rulings</b> 32:5 <b>run</b> 54:17 79:2 <b>running</b> 25:5 96:22 <b>runs</b> 8:13 <b>Russia</b> 64:20	<b>Ryan</b> 86:7,10 <hr/> <b>S</b> <hr/> <b>sad</b> 74:24 <b>sale</b> 72:23 <b>sales</b> 91:3 <b>SALLY</b> 99:4 <b>saloons</b> 82:14 <b>sanctions</b> 81:1,2 <b>Sandra</b> 66:9 <b>Sara</b> 85:7 <b>sat</b> 20:21 <b>saw</b> 25:17 33:6 71:9 76:22 83:17 97:21 <b>saying</b> 5:22 7:25 8:24 9:16 12:18,20 14:7 20:5 21:1 24:24 25:1 31:22 37:17 38:1 42:11 43:16 50:2 52:15 57:15 64:12 73:5,20 89:19 90:10 91:8,16 92:8 96:14 <b>says</b> 14:23 29:5 30:22 56:14 57:23 78:1 79:3 83:5 93:17 <b>scale</b> 80:19,20 <b>scandal</b> 93:9 <b>scandalous</b> 84:22 <b>scatter</b> 62:14 <b>scenario</b> 6:16 <b>scene</b> 19:15 <b>sceptical</b> 94:7 <b>Schillings</b> 20:1,3 <b>school</b> 92:3 <b>science</b> 92:20 <b>se</b> 51:22 <b>second</b> 1:15 11:21 17:19,22 35:20 39:18 41:12 56:5 63:15 <b>secondly</b> 54:12 82:25 <b>section</b> 17:11 94:12 95:18 <b>sections</b> 4:14 <b>see</b> 4:13 10:9 11:19,21 12:23 22:13,24 28:14 32:20 33:18 38:22 41:6 46:8 49:22 52:14 56:18 58:21 61:4 63:2 64:24 68:24 84:3 91:25 93:4 94:4 95:24	<b>seeing</b> 15:17 23:24 33:25 47:1 49:11 51:2 94:2 <b>seek</b> 95:18 <b>seeking</b> 59:23 <b>seen</b> 23:10 34:25 56:10 58:6 75:19,20 97:5 <b>segue</b> 29:13 30:6 <b>segues</b> 28:18 29:9 <b>selected</b> 49:23 <b>self-importance</b> 88:16 <b>self-regulation</b> 80:20 <b>sell</b> 19:2 51:15 51:19 79:25 91:6 <b>selling</b> 28:16 29:8 <b>sells</b> 52:6 <b>send</b> 32:2 71:18 <b>sending</b> 27:7 <b>sense</b> 16:4 31:1 33:14 62:15 90:15 93:14 <b>sent</b> 20:1 71:19 <b>sentence</b> 39:18 <b>separate</b> 27:3 33:10 35:4 96:10 <b>separately</b> 42:19 56:22 <b>September</b> 41:17 <b>sequence</b> 29:2 39:13 45:8 51:4 <b>serious</b> 14:11 47:11 <b>service</b> 72:4 <b>set</b> 19:15,19 81:9 <b>settlements</b> 89:18 <b>seven</b> 35:15 <b>sex</b> 85:15 86:4 <b>shagging</b> 67:3 <b>share</b> 28:1,2 <b>SHEAR</b> 99:12 <b>sheets</b> 50:11 <b>SHERBORNE</b> 35:23 53:14,23 54:1,12 55:3,5 56:23,25 58:5 99:7 <b>Sherborne's</b> 96:12 <b>shocked</b> 21:17 <b>shocking</b> 92:6,6 <b>short</b> 14:25 25:17 55:9 70:10 <b>shortcircuit</b> 15:14 <b>shortly</b> 76:19 <b>shot</b> 59:9	<b>shots</b> 44:25 <b>shouted</b> 46:2 <b>shoved</b> 5:11 <b>show</b> 18:11,20 33:1 64:19 89:13 <b>shown</b> 73:10 82:12 <b>shows</b> 56:14 <b>shut</b> 38:23 <b>side</b> 4:3 10:3 13:23 38:8 93:3 <b>sight</b> 6:11 <b>sign</b> 89:23 <b>signed</b> 1:10 <b>significant</b> 7:15 7:16 <b>similar</b> 13:12 15:9 50:1 75:19 <b>simplistic</b> 79:20 <b>simply</b> 4:8 49:4 49:13 62:20 70:2 78:24 79:19 85:13 <b>singer</b> 88:9 <b>single</b> 37:10 84:4 <b>singular</b> 6:1 45:4 <b>sinister</b> 6:2 22:23 26:17 <b>sir</b> 1:3 16:12 36:2 53:3,14 53:18 54:16,25 55:3 <b>sits</b> 83:4 <b>sitting</b> 45:25 <b>situation</b> 32:22 47:19 <b>six</b> 35:14 <b>sixth</b> 83:23 <b>skating</b> 76:11 <b>skip</b> 84:14 <b>skirts</b> 19:1 <b>slant</b> 69:20 <b>sleep</b> 86:1 <b>slightly</b> 45:8 50:17 70:17 96:10 <b>slut</b> 91:8 <b>SMITH</b> 99:9 <b>sold</b> 91:8 <b>soldier</b> 92:4 <b>soldiers</b> 76:23 <b>solely</b> 38:5 <b>solicitor</b> 46:19 46:22 <b>somebody</b> 13:8 34:11 61:3 62:19 73:9 <b>someone's</b> 14:18 14:19 62:14 68:20 73:1 <b>something's</b> 60:6 <b>somewhat</b> 54:4,7 <b>soon</b> 96:23 <b>sorry</b> 2:15 38:14
--	---	---	--	---	---	---

57:6 58:7 72:1 77:12 79:13 <b>sort</b> 5:6 19:23 32:22 33:14 47:19 60:13 69:23 74:16 75:15 81:25 86:25 92:15 <b>sought</b> 97:2 <b>sound</b> 31:15 <b>sounds</b> 5:1 <b>source</b> 9:3,20 16:6 17:5 38:6 <b>sources</b> 11:24 <b>speak</b> 32:21 52:23 67:22 <b>speaking</b> 1:24 48:15 75:6 <b>specific</b> 30:19 41:7 98:16 <b>specifically</b> 31:24 91:11 <b>spectrum</b> 80:9 <b>speculation</b> 9:12 9:14 28:1 39:21 52:19 <b>speech</b> 78:17 <b>speed</b> 17:13 <b>speedily</b> 54:8 <b>spin</b> 47:23 51:16 51:22 52:5,7 <b>spirit</b> 3:12 <b>splatters</b> 60:7 <b>spoke</b> 8:22 28:5 <b>spoken</b> 10:8 <b>sporadically</b> 64:1 <b>spot</b> 87:14 <b>spread</b> 63:1 <b>spurious</b> 88:15 <b>squealing</b> 82:20 <b>staff</b> 16:23 18:10 <b>stage</b> 2:6 3:18 13:9 15:10 38:13 58:19 <b>stages</b> 11:14 39:7 <b>stairs</b> 6:4 <b>staked</b> 18:12 <b>stand</b> 43:13,13 94:16,19 <b>standard</b> 65:16 <b>standing</b> 94:17 <b>stands</b> 83:13 <b>Star</b> 44:7 <b>stars</b> 88:14 <b>start</b> 2:17 35:16 40:1 88:19 <b>started</b> 18:2 19:16,20 42:10 43:9 <b>state</b> 80:2,19 <b>statement</b> 1:9,10 1:13,15,16,17 3:4 4:4,12,16 8:6 9:7,17,25 10:15,23 13:14 13:20 15:10	17:8 18:8 24:6 32:19 34:5,23 35:3,16 36:4 36:13 39:18 41:12 45:12 46:11 47:12 53:18 55:13,23 55:23 56:5 59:14 60:5 63:15 67:14 69:21 75:8 76:7 82:1 90:6 92:14 93:17 94:2 <b>statements</b> 93:15 93:18 94:24 95:5 <b>States</b> 69:4 70:1 <b>Statesman</b> 25:21 31:16 <b>status</b> 61:4 <b>statute</b> 81:13 <b>steal</b> 93:7 <b>stepped</b> 24:19 <b>steps</b> 36:21 <b>stick</b> 59:15,18 60:11 75:11 <b>stolen</b> 5:4,12 6:6 <b>stop</b> 14:20 18:20 70:10 92:8 <b>stories</b> 33:16 62:5,25 63:3,3 63:10 <b>storm</b> 4:18 5:6 37:1 39:5 41:24 51:2 67:23 <b>story</b> 5:20 7:22 8:5,9 9:3 14:15 14:19 15:22 16:7,14 20:16 21:15 25:17 28:14 30:2,4 30:12 33:25 36:24 37:4 38:2,5 42:14 42:24 43:5,11 43:13,17,18,21 44:8,20 47:18 47:20 50:15 51:23,24 52:20 53:1 55:15,17 61:7 62:13 68:18 69:6,9 69:19,19,24 70:2,7 92:2,2 <b>straight</b> 29:9 58:20,20,22 84:14 <b>strange</b> 29:13 30:6 93:13 <b>strategy</b> 47:5 49:13 71:15 <b>street</b> 40:6 45:24 <b>stress</b> 15:14 <b>strips</b> 74:10 <b>studio</b> 8:3,10,25	64:3,4 <b>studios</b> 89:11 <b>stuff</b> 8:23 25:14 27:9 52:6 74:16 <b>stupid</b> 35:20 <b>style</b> 49:25 <b>subdivides</b> 2:16 <b>subject</b> 44:9,10 67:15 81:24 90:11,16 <b>submissions</b> 95:21,23 97:16 <b>subsequent</b> 33:22 <b>subsequently</b> 17:21 19:7 24:2 37:5 44:19 45:1 91:13 <b>success</b> 3:4,11 87:12,12,16 88:1,7,8,8,14 94:6 <b>successes</b> 3:15 <b>successful</b> 7:3 88:20 <b>successive</b> 25:12 <b>suddenly</b> 3:20 25:2 <b>sued</b> 8:5 60:23 <b>suffer</b> 76:15 <b>suffered</b> 81:20 <b>sufficient</b> 2:8 <b>suggest</b> 21:8 22:1 52:19 <b>suggested</b> 37:2 48:2 <b>suggesting</b> 7:22 16:10 80:10 <b>suggestion</b> 46:18 <b>suggestions</b> 80:16 97:6 <b>suggests</b> 58:11 <b>suing</b> 14:21 <b>summer</b> 6:23 55:19 <b>Sun</b> 15:6,8,20 16:6 55:24 56:10 57:14 59:21 63:14 64:25 65:5 87:10 <b>Sunday</b> 7:25 9:3 9:19,25 28:13 54:1 <b>supplementary</b> 1:15 9:17 34:22 45:11 55:22 59:14 <b>support</b> 15:16 <b>supportive</b> 48:21 50:10 <b>suppose</b> 6:8 26:21 71:24 90:4 <b>supposition</b>	39:21,24 40:9 <b>sure</b> 16:22 17:4 19:12 21:11,11 23:8 25:11 31:12 39:24 40:19 72:17 75:20 76:10 81:15,22 96:5 97:8,22 <b>surely</b> 90:15 <b>surprised</b> 96:6 <b>surprisingly</b> 37:8 <b>surrounded</b> 45:19 <b>surveillance</b> 44:25 <b>survival</b> 84:7 <b>suspect</b> 16:25 18:22,24 19:3 <b>swapping</b> 78:7 <b>swart</b> 20:8 <b>sworn</b> 99:5,12 <b>sycophancy</b> 25:12 <b>syntax</b> 29:13 <b>system</b> 16:25 23:13 72:10	63:4 88:10 90:21 <b>talking</b> 7:5 10:8 28:16 65:25 90:19 <b>tape</b> 25:15,18 26:2,18 27:5 28:20 31:23 <b>taxi</b> 59:8,9,11 <b>taxis</b> 24:15 <b>technique</b> 14:17 38:3,4 <b>techniques</b> 62:10 <b>teeth</b> 50:16 70:18 81:4 92:25 <b>Telegraph</b> 50:5 <b>telephone</b> 9:4 <b>telephoned</b> 65:6 <b>telephoto</b> 35:8 36:9 <b>television</b> 88:6 <b>tell</b> 3:7 13:9 17:3 17:14 18:16 19:15 20:17 21:3 22:7 24:8 25:8 32:18,23 38:18,22 52:3 73:16 78:21 93:11 <b>telling</b> 23:2 <b>tells</b> 69:16,16,17 <b>ten</b> 55:6 76:8,9 <b>tenth</b> 91:22 <b>term</b> 90:8 <b>terms</b> 6:8 41:20 51:5 61:14 65:20 73:16 74:18,19 81:2 89:10 <b>terrible</b> 67:23 <b>territory</b> 73:21 <b>testify</b> 76:18 <b>testimony</b> 40:12 40:12 <b>texts</b> 42:20 <b>thank</b> 2:10,12 13:25 26:1 28:15 36:1,2 41:11 42:22 54:11 55:6,20 56:7 74:6 75:20 79:8 82:16 83:23 85:14 94:20,22 95:9,9,10 97:13 98:19,19 98:22 <b>thanks</b> 98:20 <b>theme</b> 50:7 <b>theory</b> 75:10 88:12 <b>they'd</b> 18:1,5 21:3 60:13,14 <b>thing</b> 5:21 10:6 23:3 33:3 40:23 47:20,24 47:24 51:14	58:1 67:10 71:11 84:16,17 85:8 86:15 87:22 89:25 <b>things</b> 9:18 20:6 25:9 72:9 96:4 <b>think</b> 2:25 3:12 3:19 4:1,11 6:4 6:16 7:16 9:2 9:11,15 12:4 12:18 15:11 16:1,4,9 17:9 20:3 21:12 22:12 23:6,24 32:2 40:16,24 41:7,13,16 42:10 43:23 44:7 46:7,14 46:14 51:21 52:2 56:10,25 58:2,5 59:16 61:5 63:4 64:24 66:6 67:2,9 68:1,16 69:3 72:10,14 72:24 73:7 74:1,18 76:14 77:15 78:21 79:6,14 80:7 82:1 83:7 84:9 84:17 85:16,17 86:3,11,12,23 90:23,25 91:9 91:11,19 93:18 93:22 94:11,15 94:18 95:21 96:2,10 97:9 98:8 <b>thinking</b> 5:18 8:8 25:14 95:17 <b>thinks</b> 71:5 <b>third</b> 35:21,22 40:13 78:10 <b>thought</b> 4:20 9:9 15:18 24:13,17 24:20,25 28:10 28:24 30:25 37:4 42:7 46:15 47:23 68:16 71:8 78:24 81:19 <b>thousands</b> 87:22 <b>threatened</b> 43:1 43:3 <b>three</b> 13:7 18:13 19:7 35:17 42:20 57:2,2,3 57:15 58:11 75:13 <b>throw</b> 52:17 64:21 79:18 <b>throwing</b> 78:10 78:19 <b>thrust</b> 95:4 <b>Thursday</b> 54:18 95:22 <b>time</b> 2:11,13	6:21,22,25 9:23 12:7 13:5 14:10 15:13 19:24 22:9 25:17 34:4 37:8,22 38:16 44:6 46:10,24 47:15 48:11 49:10 66:8 76:2 94:16,18 95:19,25 <b>Times</b> 50:2 <b>Tinglan</b> 37:18 38:19 39:2 42:11 46:9 48:2 <b>tiny</b> 11:10 <b>tipped</b> 16:15 <b>tired</b> 94:1 <b>title</b> 25:25 78:7 <b>titles</b> 78:7 98:12 98:13 <b>tittle-tattle</b> 59:13 61:12 <b>today</b> 9:16,18 32:21 33:2 34:21 52:9 56:11 58:17 76:22 98:21 <b>told</b> 5:18,19 20:16,21 32:22 34:14 38:25 46:18,19 52:22 58:19 90:24 <b>Tom</b> 5:20 <b>tomorrow</b> 43:11 95:25 96:8 97:9 <b>tone</b> 49:25 <b>tons</b> 4:18 86:21 <b>top</b> 33:20 34:10 34:13 40:11 <b>topic</b> 81:18 <b>topics</b> 98:16 <b>total</b> 80:5 <b>totally</b> 4:17 <b>touch</b> 39:17 72:5 <b>touched</b> 13:13 92:12 98:4 <b>tougher</b> 82:8 <b>tour</b> 64:19 <b>tours</b> 73:19,19 <b>toxic</b> 74:2 94:13 <b>toy</b> 84:7 <b>trade</b> 86:15 <b>traded</b> 86:18 <b>trades</b> 86:7,8 <b>trailer</b> 87:14 <b>transcribe</b> 26:19 <b>transcript</b> 26:2 96:22,23 <b>trauma</b> 76:21 <b>treatment</b> 4:15 <b>trials</b> 9:8 <b>tribulations</b> 9:8 <b>tried</b> 15:14 48:3 <b>triggered</b> 33:15
--	---	---	--	---	---	---

<b>trophies</b> 86:13	<b>uncontrollable</b> 64:23	76:21,22	71:2,9 78:15	<b>window</b> 46:1	<b>Wright</b> 11:4	<b>125,000</b> 51:19
<b>true</b> 15:22 16:16	<b>underlying</b> 15:22	<b>view</b> 19:10 59:23	79:19 80:1	<b>winter</b> 24:21	<b>write</b> 42:14 48:1	<b>13</b> 10:23 53:17
46:22 49:9	<b>underneath</b> 36:3	68:15 84:2	83:18,20 91:14	<b>wise</b> 38:3	49:19 62:25	<b>14</b> 13:22 14:2
67:5 72:24,24	<b>understand</b> 12:10,11,13	<b>vignette</b> 32:17	95:2 96:16,25	<b>wish</b> 4:8 20:17	69:14	54:9
74:14 75:7	22:6,13 23:20	<b>visit</b> 10:23 13:14	<b>ways</b> 71:1 92:20	25:15 35:11	<b>writing</b> 5:21	<b>15</b> 13:13 25:22
<b>trust</b> 58:3	26:7 31:8	41:20 42:3,3,7	<b>weak</b> 93:10	49:17 60:13	<b>written</b> 10:5,6	99:4,6
<b>truth</b> 1:11,17	53:23 54:6	50:24 53:23	<b>wearing</b> 20:15	85:20 93:11,14	49:24 55:15	<b>16</b> 7:6 17:8 99:7
43:5,22 49:11	60:22,24,25	70:20 75:2	<b>weary</b> 15:12	<b>wished</b> 95:24	<b>wrong</b> 43:7 49:1	<b>17</b> 7:6,8 17:8
51:11	63:12 65:16	<b>visited</b> 37:14,18	<b>wearying</b> 60:13	<b>witness</b> 1:3,9,16	70:19 77:16	50:15 56:3
<b>try</b> 14:20 15:3	66:17 77:13	41:13 42:12	<b>website</b> 62:7,13	4:4 10:23 24:6	98:12	66:2
18:25,25 39:20	84:4	51:1	<b>Weddings</b> 2:24	32:19 34:4	<b>wrongful</b> 71:11	<b>18</b> 17:11,12
40:17 42:8	<b>understanding</b> 46:10	<b>voice</b> 9:1,4	3:5,11 7:7 89:5	35:3,15 41:12	<b>wrongly</b> 12:4	<b>1921</b> 10:3
43:16 63:16	<b>undertaking</b> 89:20	<b>voiced</b> 78:14	<b>Wednesday</b> 46:9	53:18 55:13	65:5 83:19,19	<b>1932</b> 13:24,25
64:18 67:13	<b>undervest</b> 19:2	<b>voicemail</b> 22:24	95:19	63:15 98:10	85:5,6	<b>1933</b> 25:23
69:21	<b>undivine</b> 15:3	<b>voicemails</b> 19:19	<b>week</b> 21:22	<b>witnesses</b> 1:23	<b>wrote</b> 12:11	<b>1937</b> 3:1
<b>trying</b> 14:7,13	<b>unethical</b> 38:7	<b>voluntarily</b> 98:22	34:24 54:21	32:21 33:2	<hr/>	<b>1990s</b> 88:20
30:6 40:24,24	44:1 68:9	<b>vulnerable</b> 76:20	<b>weeks</b> 42:20 52:8	76:5 78:4	<b>X</b>	<b>1994</b> 2:23 3:5
41:7 54:17	91:14	93:9	57:15 58:11	98:20	<hr/>	<b>1995</b> 4:6,16
58:13 60:25	<b>underwear</b> 19:2	<hr/>	66:12	<b>Wittamore</b> 22:3	<b>X</b> 99:2	<b>1996</b> 17:6 53:16
61:18 62:3	<b>undivine-ish</b> 15:3	<b>W</b>	<b>Weeting</b> 32:20	23:25	<hr/>	53:24 54:2
63:8 70:22	<b>unethical</b> 38:7	<b>wait</b> 14:10 65:3	<b>weighing</b> 75:18	<b>Wittamore's</b>	<b>Y</b>	71:9
71:15 77:21	44:1 68:9	<b>waited</b> 14:8	<b>weird</b> 5:12 9:10	23:21	<b>yeah</b> 7:19 15:8	<b>1997</b> 54:3,7
<b>Tugendhat</b>	91:14	<b>walk</b> 6:3	16:18	<b>woman</b> 7:20 28:6	22:18,18 25:24	<hr/>
34:25 45:10	<b>unethically</b> 68:17	<b>walk-away</b> 81:8	<b>well-known</b> 73:18	37:10 50:3	28:9,23 29:15	<b>2</b>
47:8 53:6	<b>unfavourably</b> 90:16	<b>wall-to-wall</b> 89:14	<b>went</b> 14:23,24	56:19 57:12,24	31:18 38:17,21	<b>2</b> 13:24 35:14
54:20	<b>uniform</b> 20:15	<b>want</b> 2:6 24:25	16:21 25:8	59:10 74:11	39:19 41:7	<b>2,00</b> 1:2
<b>Tugendhat's</b>	<b>United</b> 69:4	27:7 31:12	28:9,23 42:8	<b>woman's</b> 58:23	44:8 47:15	<b>20</b> 45:11 82:12
55:2	86:13	32:7 35:5 36:8	45:24 59:13	<b>won</b> 8:6 86:12	55:19 56:4	94:13 99:8
<b>turn</b> 14:9 40:8	<b>unlawful</b> 91:14	38:5 46:17	63:5 92:15	<b>wonderful</b> 84:16	59:18 63:23	<b>200,000</b> 81:11
83:3,6	<b>unnecessary</b> 11:1 32:7 67:8	48:1 49:6,8	94:23	84:17	66:22 70:3	<b>2000</b> 19:23 33:7
<b>turned</b> 45:25	90:2	53:11 56:8	<b>weren't</b> 21:18	<b>wondering</b> 73:13	71:5,6 74:17	<b>2000s</b> 19:23
<b>Turning</b> 37:6	<b>unrelated</b> 52:9	58:1 68:13	30:16 36:13	<b>words</b> 3:8 33:13	74:24 76:20	<b>2002</b> 66:6
<b>TV</b> 64:18 87:14	<b>unremarkable</b> 22:20	77:14 87:5	48:23	48:3,7,8,12,24	90:7,18 93:20	<b>2004</b> 20:9 23:5
<b>tweet</b> 62:15	<b>untrue</b> 8:5 10:4	89:24 94:4,5,7	<b>Westminster</b> 13:15	49:10,15,23	<b>year</b> 1:11 13:16	28:10,24 55:19
<b>tweet</b> 59:20	70:8	97:24	<b>we'll</b> 17:9 21:21	50:2 78:12	15:11,11 24:13	<b>2005</b> 19:23 33:8
<b>twisted</b> 47:23	<b>upheld</b> 11:7,11	<b>wanted</b> 31:23	22:25 23:1	98:6	32:20 35:7	<b>2007</b> 7:18,25
48:1 49:1	11:20 12:9	33:1 54:25	29:18 31:21	<b>work</b> 34:18	54:5 67:15	<b>203</b> 99:17
69:20	13:1	81:22,23 93:22	51:5 53:4 55:6	44:13 71:15	71:10 87:22	<b>21</b> 42:20
<b>two</b> 6:25 7:13,15	<b>use</b> 60:19 63:25	<b>wants</b> 90:1	63:14 81:16	90:2	<b>years</b> 6:6 7:6,9	<b>21-year-old</b>
10:19 17:15	68:8 85:7,10	<b>Warner</b> 8:4,11	82:10 84:2	<b>worked</b> 82:11,12	25:14 30:14	50:19 60:9
18:8 27:2	<b>useless</b> 56:21	8:14 64:4	<b>we're</b> 2:5,13 4:6	87:22	38:3 40:3,4	70:19
32:21 53:14	<b>uses</b> 90:8	<b>warning</b> 20:5	7:5 22:25	<b>working</b> 18:7	50:16 66:2	<b>23</b> 54:2
54:10 55:23	<b>usually</b> 69:17	71:18	26:21 28:2	21:5,6	74:5 82:13	<b>24</b> 19:15 35:7
57:6 60:15	<b>u-turn</b> 46:5	<b>warnings</b> 19:16	32:6,6 34:10	<b>world</b> 3:14 25:4	89:18 94:13	<b>25</b> 6:6 20:9
66:2,12 77:17	<hr/>	19:20,25	34:20 36:7,7	25:10 26:12	<b>yellow</b> 74:2	<b>26</b> 24:6
90:25 93:14	<b>vain</b> 89:24	<b>warrant</b> 47:2	38:1,12 42:13	27:13 28:11,21	<b>York</b> 43:9 63:25	<b>27</b> 32:19 54:3
96:10	<b>values</b> 85:23	<b>wary</b> 15:12	57:4 61:10	28:25 34:1,12	<b>young</b> 57:12	<b>28</b> 34:7 55:13
<b>types</b> 18:24	<b>van</b> 24:16	<b>wasn't</b> 3:2 9:21	75:18 76:10	34:17 35:6	59:19	<b>29</b> 53:24
<b>typical</b> 37:23	<b>various</b> 7:2 33:6	15:8,11 21:11	77:21,22 78:25	44:10,11,18,22	<hr/>	<hr/>
<b>tyranny</b> 79:9	38:9 51:17	22:5 24:22	79:15 80:12	44:25 45:6	<b>Z</b>	<b>3</b>
80:11	72:25 73:6	26:12 27:13,16	81:9,12 89:24	60:9 61:3 62:6	<b>zenith</b> 5:6	<b>3</b> 1:11 10:2 56:11
<hr/>	80:20	28:21 37:7	89:25 96:13	63:24 64:18,19	<b>Zimbabwe</b> 79:16	<b>3,17</b> 55:8
<b>U</b>	<b>vast</b> 83:1 86:3	40:19 59:21	<b>we've</b> 1:8 24:8	70:5 73:18	80:2,5,11	<b>3,25</b> 55:10
<b>ugly</b> 52:5,7	<b>ventilation</b> 97:11	68:4 72:15	26:6 32:21	74:3 77:19	<b>zippy</b> 25:25	<b>30</b> 74:4 82:13
<b>ultimate</b> 68:24	<b>verbatim</b> 26:2	86:17 97:22,25	34:25 47:7	78:5 79:1 85:2	<hr/>	94:13
<b>ultimately</b> 83:9	<b>verdict</b> 71:22	<b>water</b> 78:11,20	53:20 64:12	<b>worry</b> 13:11	<b>1</b>	<b>3000</b> 28:15
<b>Um</b> 27:24	<b>version</b> 29:18	78:22 79:2,18	69:24 74:4	73:24	<b>1</b> 1:9 92:21	<b>35</b> 99:9,10
<b>unable</b> 57:18	48:1 49:1,2	<b>Watson</b> 5:20	76:10 77:23	<b>worse</b> 18:15	<b>1,500</b> 15:20	<b>38</b> 95:18
<b>unacceptable</b> 92:17	<b>versus</b> 83:16	<b>way</b> 4:8 6:19	82:13 93:12	<b>worst</b> 73:21	<b>10</b> 7:10 54:18	<b>39</b> 76:7
<b>unanimous</b> 73:20	<b>vertical</b> 36:3	10:16 24:24	95:22	78:16,16	71:20 87:12	<hr/>
<b>unaware</b> 35:10	<b>victims</b> 5:24	25:13 37:2	<b>whatsoever</b> 4:20	<b>worthy</b> 97:11	98:24 99:3	<b>4</b>
36:10		43:3 44:8	<b>whistleblower</b> 27:9	<b>wouldn't</b> 13:20	<b>108</b> 99:15,16	<b>4</b> 11:16,19 57:12
<b>unclear</b> 69:25		45:15 46:4	<b>white</b> 79:5	31:12,14 36:19	<b>11</b> 1:16 7:17	<b>4,28</b> 98:23
<b>uncomfortable</b> 32:1		51:8,8,24 60:3	<b>willing</b> 39:8	51:1 60:4	54:19	<b>40</b> 76:7
		61:1 70:12		72:22 94:1,5	<b>12</b> 9:24 60:23	<hr/>
				<b>wound</b> 46:1	71:21	<b>5</b>
				<b>wrap</b> 14:18		

5 38:15 87:15  
88:1,2 95:22  
5,000 15:16  
50 17:3  
50p 91:6  
500 17:4  
56 99:11  
58 99:12,13

---

**6**

6 39:18  
61-year-old  
45:23

---

**7**

7 4:4 84:6

---

**8**

8 7:2 91:18  
81 90:5  
82 90:5  
85 87:11  
86 92:16  
88 92:14

---

**9**

9 95:16  
98 99:14