

Linklaters

John Whittingdale OBE MP
Chairman
Culture, Media and Sport Committee
House of Commons
7 Millbank
London
SW1P 3JA

12 September 2011

Our Ref JWT

Dear Sir

Thank you for your letter of 6 September.

The discussion with the Metropolitan Police took place on the morning of 11 August 2011, at approximately 11 a.m., at Thomas More Square. The meeting followed a longer meeting held that morning to discuss a variety of issues relevant to the criminal inquiry. At the end of that longer meeting, our Mr John Turnbull, Mr Simon Greenberg (a member of the Management and Standards Committee of News Corporation) and a senior police officer, went into Mr Greenberg's office and the discussion commenced. No note was taken of the meeting and no written advice was provided.

The meeting was short - no more than fifteen minutes or so. The police officer made it clear that he would not direct or instruct the company - the final decision regarding redactions had to be for the company alone. There was a general discussion about the issue of redactions - in particular, the potential difficulties that can be caused in a police investigation if names and new lines of enquiry are put into the public arena prematurely.

After the meeting concluded, Mr Turnbull then telephoned a colleague at Linklaters and told him about the discussion. Mr Turnbull had formed his own judgment about what redactions were appropriate in light of the discussion at the meeting. He decided to take out anything in the papers which identified any individuals by name, title or group. He also decided to redact paragraphs (iii) and (iv) of the 2 March letter, because those paragraphs did not relate to matters Harbottle & Lewis had been instructed to investigate and Mr Turnbull thought that they suggested a new line of enquiry which could be prejudiced if made public. Mr Turnbull did not go through each point to be redacted individually but rather gave some examples and explained in general terms what he wanted to achieve.

Lawyers from Clifford Chance were on that call. Clifford Chance act for James Murdoch and were putting together the final letter and enclosures for signature by their client. Clifford Chance and Linklaters then produced the enclosures bearing the proposed redactions. Mr Turnbull discussed these with his colleague on his way back to the office and satisfied himself that the redactions accorded with his instructions. The documents were then sent by Linklaters to Jeffrey Palker (a member of the Management and Standards

Linklaters

Committee of News Corporation). Mr Palker also sent the enclosures bearing the redactions to Matthew Anderson (a senior communications executive with News International), Frederic Michel (a senior government relations executive at News International), Simon Greenberg and Jessica Rivett (a lawyer employed by Olswang and seconded to the Management and Standards Committee of News Corporation).

Mr Palker suggested that Mr Cloke's mobile phone number be redacted just in case Mr Cloke still used the number. That was done. Apart from that no further redactions were made or existing redactions altered and no News International or News Corporation officer or employee suggested any redaction to Linklaters. We understand that Clifford Chance sent the enclosures bearing the redactions to Jeffrey Palker, Tracey Iles (personal assistant to James Murdoch) and Kate McEwan (personal assistant to Jeffrey Palker). None of those individuals or James Murdoch suggested any redactions (other than the earlier redaction suggested by Mr Palker and referred to above).

Neither we nor Clifford Chance are aware of any other News International or News Corporation officer or employee being aware of the redactions before the letter of 11 August 2011 was sent to you.

Yours faithfully



Linklaters LLP