

From: <richard.wiseman@shell.com>
Subject: **FW: For your information**
Date: 17 June 2008 09:10:15 GMT+01:00
To: <john@shellnews.net>
Cc: <michiel.brandjes@shell.com>

Dear Mr Donovan

I have emailed your father to tell him that I have nothing to add to the correspondence we have already exchanged on the matters set out in his email.

However, I appreciate that he was not at the hearing in 1999. He may not therefore know the circumstances behind our offer to contribute at that time to your legal expenses (the information which did not go to the judge). You will recall that we made this contribution having been told by your solicitor that his firm had taken a charge on your house to secure their costs which they intended to enforce. We took the view that enforcement of their charge and your losing your house would probably be used by you against us, even though you had started the proceedings, and for that reason alone, we made the contribution to your costs to avoid your losing your home.

Regards

Richard Wiseman

Legal Services
Shell International Limited
Registered in England and Wales
Registered Office, Shell Centre, London SE1 7NA
Company number 3075807

Tel: +44 20 7934 5544 **Fax:** +44 20 7021 3023 **Mobile:** +44 7785 381779

-----Original Message-----

From: Alfred Donovan [mailto:alfred@shellnews.net]
Sent: 17 June 2008 01:16
To: Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF; Alfred Donovan
Cc: Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC
Subject: Re: For your information

Dear Mr Wiseman

THE TRANSCRIPT KNOWN AS THE "JUDGES COMMENTS"

Although pleased you have not quibbled about my account of events, I see that once again you have the "Judges Comments" on your mind and once again have opened a can of worms.

I had in fact already stated my intention in that regard as can be seen in my email. Since it seems unlikely that a veteran barrister of your vast experience and skill would have missed the reference I placed in brackets to make it more prominent, I can only assume that you deliberately mentioned the subject to emphasize the importance you attach to them.

It may be a delicate matter, but it was of course your ill considered decision to raise the Judges Comments with a third party company (you could not resist the temptation on that occasion either) that breached the peace treaty and in turn led to our website and the dire impact it has had on Shell.

At the time the Judge made his one-sided comments, he was unaware of the true settlement terms. One document was completely withheld from him. We know this because the actual documents put before him were listed in the transcript of the Judges Comments. Mr Justice Laddie did not know that Shell had agreed to pay my legal fees or that I would receive a payment. I had made it plain to my legal team that I would not enter into a compromise settlement without my legal fees being paid and without receiving a payment.

The transcript of the Judges Comments also reveal the blazing exchanges between the Judge and my lead barrister Geoffrey Cox (now known as Geoffrey Cox QC MP). Mr Cox exposed the comments as being outrageously impartial. The row which erupted in open court moved into the Judges chambers and only subsided when the Judge was told the true circumstances of the settlement, as opposed to the so called "joint press statement", the content of which was false and designed by Shell to deceive the media, its employees and shareholders. In my experience, a fairly typical Shell press statement. I understand that the Judge revealed that his clerk, Peter Smith, who had been present in court throughout the trial, had drawn on an entirely conclusion about who was giving perjured testimony.

As you know, we wrote to the Lord Chancellor Lord Falconer some time after the trial to complain about the conduct of the Judge and the importance of having a fair trial before an impartial Judge.

We pointed out the charade carried out in Court by the legal team acting for Shell. An attempt was made at entrapment. Geoffrey Hobbs QC was informed in a stage whisper by a solicitor from DJ Freeman that a messenger on a motorbike was on route from Sainsbury's with evidence which would prove I had committed fraud. That was the inference of the stage whisper. I heard what was said, as did the Judge and my legal team. Mr Justice Laddie said: *"I have very acute hearing. I am deliberately not listening, but I am also immensely inquisitive and I am finding it hard."* As you know, a well-known forensic expert Dr Aubrey Giles later scientifically examined the letters in question and said that there was no foundation to the allegation. I will publish her report alongside the related information.

In fact there was no messenger, no motorbike and no documents on route. It was all a total fabrication. The Judge did not make any indication of displeasure in open court about the disgraceful deception played on him, the court and on me, by Shell's seedy solicitors now known as Kendall Freeman. Please feel free to disassociate yourself with the deception. I know you were present in court for almost the entire trial and I believe you were present at that point, which was the climax of my cross-examination. But I could be wrong. Perhaps you were not in on the deceit?

It is also a matter of deep concern that the Judge never revealed his commercial connection with Tom Moody-Stuart, the barrister son of Sir Mark Moody-Stuart. This was despite the fact that a letter from Lady Judy Moody-Stuart to my father was given to the Judge soon after the trial commenced. The degree of personal animosity between the Moody-Stuart family and my family was clear from the correspondence and should have set alarm bells ringing given his connection with a member of the Moody-Stuart family. However the Judge did not recuse himself.

Neither did he disclose that a long time friend, IP Consultant Tony Willoughby, had Shell as a client. By coincidence or otherwise, sometime after our letter to Lord Falconer, Mr Laddie resigned from being a High Court Judge in controversial circumstances. Shortly thereafter he joined Willoughby & Partners, which as far as I know, still has Shell as a client. He has also had a more recent commercial relationship with you.

Of course we should take into account that it is a small mostly London based club of lawyers involved in such specialist matters and it must result in what some might view as rather incestuous relationships. However, I am sure Professor Sir Hugh Laddie QC as he is now known, would never deliberately act improperly in any way.

I am however concerned that subliminal prejudice led to inappropriate conduct by him during the latter stages of the trial as spelt out in the letter to the Lord Chancellor, which will also be published on the same webpage in due course.

We were entitled to a fair trial free of intimidation and deception. That was not what occurred and because of the underhand tactics used by Shell, we were placed at a disadvantage in negotiating the settlement dramatically proposed by Shell to bring an end to the cross-examination of the dishonest Shell manager at the heart of all the claims, AJL.

As you may recall, the documentary evidence and testimony covered the conspiracy masterminded by AJL to deceive companies who thought they were participating in a fairly conducted tender process for a major Shell contract. The contract was instead awarded to an agency that AJL had a close personal relationship with and which had not even been in the tender process. This was like a horse winning a race in which it had not run.

We had a mutually beneficial business relationship with Shell for over a decade before the arrogant, unprofessional and thoroughly dishonest Shell manager AJL arrived on the scene.

Regards
John Donovan

On 16/06/2008 16:42, "richard.wiseman@shell.com" <richard.wiseman@shell.com> wrote:

Thank you for letting me know. I assume that if you are creating a complete archive you will include a copy of the Comments of Mr Justice Laddie (as he then was) of 6 July 1999.

Regards

Richard Wiseman

Legal Services
Shell International Limited
Registered in England and Wales
Registered Office, Shell Centre, London SE1 7NA
Company number 3075807

Tel: +44 20 7934 5544 **Fax:** +44 20 7021 3023 **Mobile:** +44 7785 381779

-----Original Message-----

From: John Donovan [<mailto:john@shellnews.net>]

Sent: 16 June 2008 16:14

To: Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF; Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC

Cc: Alfred Donovan

Subject: For your information

Dear Mr Wiseman

We have decided to publish on the internet a great deal more of the background information about our dealings with Shell.

It is initially being assembled on the following webpage...

The volume of information being added to the images file is such, including a complete transcript of the trial (with the Judges Comments) that it will take time to complete, but we now have the technology to put it all on the Internet. Selected information from the webpage will be transferred and published on our main website so that it reaches a wider audience and of course is also picked up by the search engines.

No doubt you will let me know if you object to any aspect of these plans and if so, the basis for the objection. If I do not hear from you or Mr Brandjes within the next 24 hours, I will assume Shell has no problem or objection to what we are doing, as revealed herein.

Regards
John Donovan