

Jeffrey/Mike,

The cover on the current edition of PRIVATE EYE carries a very provocative photograph and caption under the headline "ANDY'S FRIEND RESCUES FERGIE". If you go on to their website and scroll down to the bottom of the page you will find an advertisement for the current issue showing the cover.

I believe this to be a direct result of the D of Y's comments which brought her into the controversy and encouraged this sort of coverage. Although PRIVATE EYE is an absolute rag of a publication, nonetheless it is currently sitting in a prominent position on newsagents' stands here in the UK.

I firmly believe that I should approach Rod Christie-Miller again, leaving him in no doubt that, either in the context of the action we are taking against the Daily Telegraph or otherwise, we may have no alternative but to discredit his clients, by pointing out that she and her daughters were among the first to welcome Jeffrey upon your release from prison, and that all three have been frequent house guests in the intervening period. While I had already averred in passing to this situation, I think I now should take the gloves off and point out that, notwithstanding your wish not to cause any unnecessary embarrassment to Prince Andrew, that you are being left with absolutely no choice in this regard.

Mike and I are also both agreed that you should give serious consideration in facilitating an article in the UK press, setting out the actual facts and, while expressing remorse, using the opportunity to compare the outrageous treatment you have received compared to that of the Italian PM etc. Obviously this will have to be thought through carefully, but I believe it to be a potentially credible option.

On another note, if I do not receive a response from the Telegraph by the close of business on Monday, I would propose putting a call through to their lawyer, pointing out that while you have no particular wish to become involved in protracted litigation with the Daily Telegraph, you are nonetheless determined not to let matters rest under any circumstances.

I would also propose drafting a letter to The Mail putting them on notice in relation to the breach of confidentiality/privacy issues and also the core defamatory allegation to enable us to get a feel of how the overall approach would look, and we can discuss the potential ramifications between us before making a final decision on whether to release same.

Let me know what you think.

Kind regards.

Paul Tweed

Senior Partner

Belfast | Dublin | London

t:

f:

m:

e:

w: www.johnsonslaw.com

b: www.globallibeldebate.com

London Office: 21 Arlington Street, London, SW1A 1RN

t:

f:

Regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

Firm SRA ID: [REDACTED]

<http://www.sra.org.uk/rules>

Paul Tweed is also a member of Paul Tweed LLP

Regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

SRA ID: [REDACTED]

Disclaimer:

This e-mail transmission may be legally privileged but is, in any event, confidential and intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or disseminate the information in it, or take any action in reliance of it. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Johnsons Solicitors. If you have received this message in error, do not open any attachment, but please notify the individual sender (above) deleting this message from your system. Please rely on your own virus check. While reasonable efforts are made to ensure that e-mails are free from bugs or virus infection, no responsibility is taken by Johnsons Solicitors for any damage arising from any bug or virus infection