

To: jeevacation@gmail.com[jeevacation@gmail.com]
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thur 4/14/2011 5:48:40 PM
Subject: MORE, can we talk later?

Here is some more (cut and pasted) and a description from their perspective. Let me know what you think? I think this is causing as much heartache to them as it is to you.

Below is the reason for our concern:

Rod,

Further to our telephone conversation yesterday, I would confirm that in the absence of a satisfactory response from the *Daily Telegraph*, who have clearly been buoyed up to some extent by your client's comments, I am likely to be put in a position, notwithstanding my client's reservations, where I will have to undermine the credibility of those comments by pointing out that your client and her daughters were among the first to enjoy my client's hospitality upon his release from prison and continued to do so until very recently.

As I have emphasised to you, my client has absolutely no desire to cause any unnecessary embarrassment to either your client or her former husband, but her unwarranted (or misquoted) comments have placed him in an extremely difficult position, and have to be corrected.

I would therefore invite your client to reconsider her current stance and look forward to hearing from you asap.

Kind regard,

Paul

Paul Tweed
Senior Partner

The tenor of this email is somewhat alarming and could be construed as attempted blackmail.

Unfortunately S cannot "reconsider her current stance" as she never spoke to the Telegraph newspaper and so cannot be held responsible for their views and nor could she make them change their view. This has to be a matter for JE's lawyers to sort out with them directly.

Now on to what S was able to get changed of the original headline that caused S so much concern as she knew the state of JE's case and managed to get them to change their headline on the day in question:

the 'before' and 'after' headlines from the Evening Standard following the Duchess's interview.

The original headline was: **Fergie: I'm so sorry I let child abuser pay my debt**

This was then changed to: **Duchess of York apologises for 'gigantic error of judgement' over debt**

The later headline is still posted on the Evening Standard's website.

This much she could and has changed to reflect the circumstances of JE NOT being anything like what is suggested in the UK media. I also understand that the Evening Standard, whose Editor conducted the interview, was well aware of the exact nature of JE's case and the correct language to use but chose not to do so. S warned him of the sensitivity in her interview.

We are both devastated that JE is being treated in this manner and we would very much like to help him but are somewhat constrained by me and my position and the fact that the media, in the UK, are taking a totally unreasonable attitude towards JE. However neither S nor I can be held responsible for their interpretation of the case.

I hope this helps JE understand, one, the difficulty we face in trying to help him and, two, the very alarming tone to his lawyers email to S's lawyer. We both hope that the lawyer can be brought into line or to heel.

It would be so much easier if we were able to discuss face to face but that can't be achieved and so I hope you can continue to be a conduit to find a suitable resolution to this.