

The Leveson Inquiry

**EXHIBIT "CB1" OF THE
WITNESS STATEMENT OF CHERIE BLAIR**

Dear Editor,

With reference to the article on page ten and eleven in the Mail on Sunday dated 7th January 2007, we feel that both the Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University and Dadi Janki, were misrepresented.

From reading the article, your readers will not have a clear understanding of who we are, the work we do and the millions of people that have benefited from our work across the world.

When your journalist approached us, prior to the article being published, he was invited to come and meet us personally in order to gain a clear understanding of the Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University. Unfortunately, this invitation was not taken up.

The article is neither fair nor investigated thoroughly, in any area.

Our offer to you visit us is still open.

Your sincerely,

Maureen Goodman
Program Co-ordinator

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

23 May 2003

The Editor,
The Daily Mail,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about further breaches of the PCC Code contained in an article in the Daily Mail of 24th May 2003 page 32-33 entitled "Carole the Conqueror".

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code and I note that you are, in addition, a member of the Commission. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

" i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

iii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

- 2 -

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party"

The whole article is based on a completely false premise which is that Carole Caplin who is engaged by me as a personal trainer and adviser on my clothes has somehow "triumphed" or eclipsed the role of Fiona Millar in No 10. This is totally untrue. Fiona Millar remains the crucial and important adviser to me in all aspects of my life as she has been since she first started working for me in 1994. Had your reporters bothered to ask either Ms Millar or myself about the true position before writing a whole article based on conjecture, they would have been told precisely that.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you correct this false impression about the relationship between myself and Ms Millar as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

23 May 2003

The Editor,
The Daily Mail,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Daily Mail of 10th May 2003 page 7 by a Gordon Rayner entitled "What did Cherie (salary £250,000) give Tony for his 50th birthday? Two £10 bottles of wine she got for free on her trip to Australia."

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code and I note that you are, in addition, a member of the Commission. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

" i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

iii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

- 2 -

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party”

The article contained a series of total and significant inaccuracies and gave a distorted picture based on conjecture masquerading as unattributed fact. As such it is in clear breach of the Code.

The following is a list of inaccuracies contained in this one article:

- a) I did not give the Prime Minister a birthday present of two £10 bottles of wine or any wine at all Australian or otherwise. I am astonished as to how your reporter can possibly know what was a totally private gift between husband and wife. I would be delighted if you could explain how your reporter came to write such untruths.
- b) It is totally untrue that I have a “salary” of £250,000. Can you please explain on what basis your reporter justifies printing as fact that which is complete and untrue speculation.
- c) It is not true that I have “helped myself” to £2000 worth of designer clothes in Australia or indeed anywhere else. What is the factual basis for such an assertion?
- d) I have not “accepted free holidays around the world”. How does your reporter justify this?
- e) Neither have I “accepted cut price clothes and financial advice from convicted conman Peter Foster”. Please explain the factual basis for this assertion.
- f) Finally it is completely untrue that I give picture frames (recycled or otherwise) to staff a Downing Street as presents whether once, twice, three or four years running as alleged. What is the factual basis for this conjecture?

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of these inaccuracies and distortions as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

- 3 -

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of this breach of the Code as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done. I should point out that the Press Association, by a letter to me dated 22nd July 2004 has already apologised for distributing what they recognise as a photograph of a private person on a private occasion. I am sure, given your responsible position on the PCC that you would wish to do the same.

As a matter of courtesy I am sending a copy of this letter to Lord Rothermere.

Yours



Cherie Booth QC

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

25 June 2003

The Editor,
The Evening Standard,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Madam,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

Thank you for your letter of 18th June 2003. With respect, your duty under the PCC Code is set out in Article 1 of the Code which I repeat.

“ i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

Whatever is said in other newspapers, as editor you are obliged to respect the cCode in your newspaper. The fact is there are two inaccuracies. Firstly, the words “ordered” and “in front of Ms Millar” were both written by Joe Murphy. I repeat they are both without any factual basis and untrue and should be corrected.

Secondly, you have not answered my complaint. I reiterate what I said in my letter. The incident which is described in detail over three paragraphs in the fourth and fifth columns of the article, did not take place and is complete fabrication. Both Ms Millar and Mr Powell confirm that this is the case. In the face of these denials I cannot see how you can possibly continue to assert that this allegation is true and I require you now to comply with your obligations in the Code which is to justify what you actually write not what you now say you meant. I look forward to hearing from you as to when you will print a correction about this inaccuracy.

I also repeat my earlier request

- 2 -

“I ask that you respond to my request for justification of these inaccuracies and distortions as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.”

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

Paul Dacre
The Daily Mail,
Northcliffe House,
2 Derry Street,
London W8 5TT

29/10/03

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my dismay about the inaccuracies found within your article, '..... buisness', surrounding a private appointment between the Prime Ministers wife and myself, published in your paper, Saturday October 25th 2003.

I would like to take this opportunity to clarify the situation, in the hope that you will refrain from printing such unsubstantiated and untrue information in the future.

I refer to the inaccuracies in turn.

1. 'Costelloe's couture designs normally sell for no less than £3000' – I am a ready-to-wear Designer, who has on special occasions dressed high profile clients. My brand is not couture and the prices reflect that. The brand has an upper-end retail price structure with prices for suits ranging from £400- £550.
2. 'Miss Caplin is understood to have negotiated substantial discounts for her friend' - Miss Caplin at no point negotiated discounts for the Prime Minister's wife.

I look forward to your response,

Yours faithfully,

Mr Paul Costelloe

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

26 January 2004

The Editor,
The Daily Mail,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Daily Mail of 26th January 2004 page 4, by a Gordon Rayner entitled "Cherie, Bush and the gaffes that drove Campbell to quit No 10."

Your article, whilst purporting to report what is contained in a book by Philip Stephens, says this: "She embarrassed him (the Prime Minister) with her undisguised animosity towards President Bush during meetings." It then claims I berated Bush in person with the accusation that he "stole the election".

Whilst I completely refute Philip Stevens's allegation that I have ever expressed such a view to anyone on how the US Presidential Election was won, the Daily Mail could at least lift his story accurately from the Times. Philip Stevens doesn't allege that this conversation took place in front of President Bush. In fact he says I behaved "impeccably" when I met the President. As for the allegation that I "picked an argument" over dinner with President Bush about the death penalty, as No 10 told the Times, my discussions with President Bush, including the discussions we had at a family dinner about the death penalty, have always been good-natured.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of these inaccuracies and distortions as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

- 2 -

Yours

Radisson Hotel Shanghai New World, 88 Nanjing Road (W), Shanghai 200003

6 December 2005

Dear Sir,

Comments by the "charming Mrs Daubeny" have been brought to my attention here in Shanghai. Geoffrey Levy telephoned her twice to ask questions about my hard working colleague Euan Blair. The truth is that she was never at the relaxing dinner that I had with Euan, after we had completed "Charlie and the Chocolate Factory" in November last year. I was then worrying about how I was going to close Whitehall and Parliament Square for three nights and fill the streets with tanks and paramilitary troops for my next film "V for Vendetta". I said as an aside that I wished I could ask his mother for help. That simply stated wish was as far as it went. It was never picked up or responded to. The next morning I contacted Film London, the City of Westminster, the Metropolitan Police and Transport for London and they all supported our venture before the Ministry of Defense and others came on board.

Yours,

Nicholas Daubeny

Our Ref:
E-mail:
Direct Dial:
Direct Fax:

Head of Legal
Associated Newspapers Limited

DX Legal Department 96375 Kensington High Street 3
By Fax and DX

7 December 2005

STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL
NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir

Cherie Blair – Daily Mail Saturday, 3 December 2005

We represent Cherie Blair and her family, and write in respect of the article by Geoffrey Levy which was published on pages 20 and 21 of last Saturday's Daily Mail.

In that article, you make the clear allegation that our client offered inappropriate assistance to her son, Euan, whilst he was undertaking work experience with Mr Nicholas Daubeny – a location manager working on his latest film "V for Vendetta".

You state that Mrs Daubeny said:

"I know people say it was influence that got the permission to film in Westminster, but it wasn't like that" says the charming Mrs Daubeny. "Cherie Blair did offer to be helpful – she would have smoothed the way. But Nick decided it would be better not to do it through her in the end and, as it turned out, he didn't use the connection, if you see what I mean."

This statement by Mrs Daubeny is entirely false. At no time did Euan Blair request assistance from his mother in relation to closing down Whitehall for three nights last May for filming, nor did she ever

offer such assistance. Your article clearly suggests that Mrs Blair would be prepared to go to extreme lengths to exert her influence to help her son in this manner. This is wholly inaccurate and shows our client in a very poor light. You are also fully aware that it is not within our client's power or influence to close down Whitehall for a number of nights for filming. You even say in your article that "*The producer surprisingly got permission from the relevant 14 authorities to close off parts of Whitehall from around midnight until 4am for three days in May while they shot scenes involving tanks and a thousand actors dressed as soldiers.*" The suggestion that our client could simply have exerted her influence to organising matters without a second thought in order to assist her son, is as preposterous as it is insulting.

For the sake of clarity, we can confirm that Mr Daubeny has made it clear to us that his wife was not present at the dinner that he had with Euan and that her comments which you have quoted are wholly inaccurate.

As you will know from the Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice, at paragraph 1 (i) it states that "*The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information ... (ii) A significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distortion once recognised must be corrected, promptly and with due prominence, and – where appropriate – an Apology published ...*"

It was quite clear in this instance that our client is entitled to a correction, and we shall provide its wording and discuss its prominence once you have agreed this course of action. We also expect our clients' legal costs to be covered by your newspaper, which are currently in the sum of £550 plus VAT.

We look forward to hearing from you as a matter of urgency.

Yours faithfully

Campbell Hooper

cc Editor, Daily Mail

Daily Mail (London)

March 16, 2007 Friday

An everyday tale of council folk...; LITTLEJOHN

BYLINE: RICHARD LITTLEJOHN

SECTION: ED 1ST; Pg. 17

TONIGHT, on Comic Relief, Alastair Campbell (above) goes into the stocks and is pelted with wet sponges.

Also, we learn that in addition to his Pounds 1 million book deal, Campbell has been hired as a PR adviser by a company which runs thousands of buses and trains in Britain.

If his track record is anything to go by, the timetables will turn out to be a complete work of fiction, the chief financial officer will be accused of having 'psychological flaws' and it won't be long before one of the company's most experienced railway inspectors commits suicide.

EDUCATION Secretary Alan Johnson wants grandfathers to go into classrooms to act as role models for boys.

It was only last week that he was pouring scorn on the notion that marriage provides the most stable environment for bringing up children.

So where are these fine, upstanding role models coming from? Are they going to be absentee grandads, aged about 30?

We're not talking Clive Dunn here.

A get-out-of-jail-free Cherie card. Wicked!

THE WICKED WITCH has weighed in on the side of those in the Leftwing legal establishment who are determined to keep criminals out of jail.

She's backing something called '**restorative justice**'. In essence, this means that anyone guilty of violence, sexual assault, robbery or theft can avoid a prison sentence if they agree to meet their victim and apologise. So that's all right, then.

Even if you batter an old lady half to death, just so long as you say sorry afterwards you won't have to do any porridge.

This dangerous nonsense is gathering currency in the 'criminal justice' community, despite pilot studies showing it doesn't prevent its beneficiaries reoffending.

Hardened criminals will say anything to avoid jail. They don't mean it.

That's why prison is the best place for them.

Have you noticed that this leniency would apply only to those convicted of what most of us would consider very serious crimes?

Don't think you'll be let off a fine if you say sorry for doing 34mph in a 30mph limit, parking on a yellow line, forgetting to pay your congestion charge or putting the wrong kind of rubbish in the wrong sack. Only yesterday, we learned

that even people fined for letting their dogs foul the footpath are going to be forced to provide DNA samples.

You might have thought a passionate 'yuman rites' lawyer would be leading the charge against this outrage.

And if the WW is so keen on apologies, when is she going to ask her husband to say sorry for all the crimes he's committed against the British people - including selling honours for cash and taking us to war on the basis of a dodgy dossier cobbled together off the net?

As Yates of the Yard closes in, an apology might be all that keeps Blair out of jail.

THE DAILY MAIL

Telegrams, Daily Mail, London, W.B.
Telephone: 020-7938 6000

Northcliffe House,
2 Derry Street,
Kensington,
London, W8 5TT

Ms Cherie Booth QC
Matrix Chambers
Griffin Building
Gray's Inn
London WC1R 5LN

22/3/07

Dear Ms Booth,

Thank you for your letter of 19 March and the enclosure of the transcript of your Letter to the Editor.

Mr Littlejohn did not say your talk meant anyone guilty of a serious crime can avoid a prison sentence. He said you were allying yourself with those in the Left-wing legal establishment who are advocating "restorative justice".

"Restorative justice" advocates alternative approaches to penal sentences involving more informal mechanisms such as mediation, apologies and reparations between victims and offenders. Its main aim is to find solutions other than jail for criminals.

While you appear not to go so far as many disciples of "restorative justice" do, Mr Littlejohn has every right to express his opposition to a movement with whose aims he strongly disagrees.

That said, if you would like to send us a letter making plain your personal position on jail sentences I will recommend it to the Editor for publication.

Yours sincerely

Robin Esser
Executive Managing Editor

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

06 August 2012

Paul Dacre,
The Daily Mail,
Northcliffe House,
2 Derry Street,
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article and photograph in the Daily Mail on Thursday 22nd July 2004 showing my son, Nicholas Blair and his friend at the Pope's weekly audience at the Vatican.

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code. In addition I note that you are a member of the PCC.

The Code itself provides:

In its preamble

“The Code is the cornerstone of the system of self-regulation to which the industry has made a binding commitment. Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications.”

and

“It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest.”

- 2 -

Article 3 Privacy provides

"i) Everyone is entitled to respect for his or her private and family life, home, health and correspondence. A publication will be expected to justify intrusions into any individual's private life without consent."

Article 6 Children provides

"v) Where material about the private life of a child is published, there must be justification for publication other than the fame, notoriety or position of his or her parents or guardian."

The article makes it clear that the only reason the photograph was published was because of the identity of Nicholas's father. The use of the picture of an eighteen year old boy on a private visit to the Vatican solely on the basis that his father is a public figure is not only a breach of article 3 but also of article 6.

Although it is the standard practice of the Vatican to release pictures taken at the Pope's weekly audience, it is not the standard practice or even occasional practice of the Mail to publish them. As soon as Downing Street became aware that the photograph had been released they made sure that all the National Newspapers were aware of their wish that Nicholas's privacy be respected. In the case of the Mail, when David Hughes rang the Press Office to ask about the photograph, he was informed in clear terms that no consent had been given for the photograph to be disseminated or published. The other newspapers respected that request. The Mail did not.

There is no justification for your breach of the Code. I would also draw your attention to the recent decision of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Von Hannover v Germany in which the Court said this

"The Court considers that a fundamental distinction needs to be made between reporting facts – even controversial ones – capable of contributing to a debate in a democratic society relating to politicians in the exercise of their functions, for example, and reporting details of the private life of an individual who, moreover, as in this case, does not exercise official functions. While in the former case the press exercises its vital role of "watchdog" in a democracy by contributing to "impart[ing] information and ideas on matters of public interest (*Observer and Guardian*, cited above, *ibid.*) it does not do so in the latter case."

Nicholas is a private individual who has never courted publicity and who did not court publicity in this case. Despite the fact that media are routinely present during the Pope's regular audiences, not only did Nicholas believe his identity was unknown to them, but it never occurred to him that anyone would be interested in publishing his photograph. In these circumstances there can be no public interest justification for publishing photographs of him whether at the Vatican or in any other place.

- 3 -

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA



The Editor,
The Daily Mail,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

Thank you for your letter dated the 3rd June 2002 and your statement that you are prepared to set the record straight, which is of course what you are required to do under the Code.

I shall deal first with what appear to be the areas where accept that you cannot justify your report. Firstly in respect of Fiona Millar my complaint was about the suggestion that as your headline put it Ms Caplin was "the Conqueror". True you do not use the word "eclipsed" but I maintain it was a fair summary of an article which did use words such as "conqueror" "her main rival" "unstoppable rise" and "triumphed" to point out just a few. You have not in fact contradicted the main thrust of my complaint which was

"The whole article is based on a completely false premise which is that Carole Caplin who is engaged by me as a personal trainer and adviser on my clothes has somehow "triumphed" or eclipsed the role of Fiona Millar in No 10. This is totally untrue. Fiona Millar remains the crucial and important adviser to me in all aspects of my life as she has been since she first started working for me in 1994." Under the Code, I am entitled to a correction which makes that clear.

As for the article which stated categorically that my alleged "birthday present" to the Prime Minister was two bottles of £10 wine, can I take it that you accept my word that I did not give him such a gift for his birthday? I assume now that you know the truth that you will print a correction.

- 2 -

I am sure you are not so naive as to ask me to believe that as Editor of a national newspaper you do not know the difference between a salary and an estimate of a self employed person's earnings. Your own assertion in the letter that others put the figure higher acknowledges that it is in fact total speculation. Under the Code you cannot pass off speculation as fact whether or not other newspapers have speculated in the past. In these circumstances your duties under the Code are clear.

As for the Melbourne incident whatever may have happened in the past I have now denied to you that I helped myself to £2000 worth of designer clothes. I trust you will now accept that that is untrue.

It is indeed true that I have been on holiday to the places you mention, but how do you justify saying these holidays were "free"?

Similarly, clumsy punctuation or not, the article states that I accepted cut price clothes from Peter Foster and must be corrected. Since you mention it in your letter may I also take the opportunity to correct your assertion that Peter Foster ever paid £4000 to an accountant to arrange a mortgage for me. No payment whatsoever was made on my behalf by Peter Foster. Anyone with even a elementary idea of the mortgage market would have been put on alert as to the falseness of the allegation from the ridiculous amount claimed and as a prudent editor I am sure you must realise that this is yet another product of Mr Foster's fertile imagination. However, since you did not mention this in the article I do not require you to correct that publicly, I merely ask that you amend you records accordingly.

I am not going to enter into a debate with you about the meaning of the words "financial advice". I disagree with your interpretation and I simply ask that you be more careful with your assertions in the future.

The fact remains that your alleged "sources" have told you an untruth if they are asserting that either I, or indeed anyone on my behalf, has given "recycled" or otherwise photo frames to serving staff in No 10. I require you to correct this inaccuracy in accordance with your obligations under the Code.

I am pleased that you accept that you cannot support the accuracy of the allegation that "the Blairs" pay Ms Caplin up to £4000 per month. As I read the Code it is no excuse for you as editor to justify printing an inaccuracy just because others have printed similar falsehoods. Now that I have told you that this is wholly untrue, I require you to correct this inaccuracy as well.

- 3 -

I am looking forward to hearing from you when the corrections will be made.

Yours

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA



The Editor,
The Mail on Sunday,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Mail on Sunday of 5th July 2003 page 2 by a Tom Rawstone and David Hughes entitled "We're all going on a freebie holiday"

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

" i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

iii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party"

- 2 -

The article alleges that Carole Caplin "caused something of a scene at the Blair's French retreat by turning up to dinner in a see-through top. She also sunbathed topless next to the pool, embarrassing the Prime Minister's teenage son Nicky"

It is untrue that there was any kind of scene at dinner of the kind described, and it is equally untrue that Nicky was embarrassed by Carole's sunbathing.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA



The Editor,
The Mail on Sunday,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Mail on Sunday of 8th June 2003 page 5 by a Jonathan Oliver entitled "How Cherie hopes to become an Olympic champion"

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

"i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

iii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party"

- 2 -

The article alleges that I am campaigning to win the "£200,000 a year part time job". This is totally untrue as both I and David Welch of the Daily Telegraph have already made clear to your colleague, the editor of the Evening Standard. As such it is in clear breach of the Code.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of this inaccuracy and distortion as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA



The Editor,
The Evening Standard,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Madam,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Evening Standard of 4th June 2003 page 3 by a Patrick Hennessy and Adrian Walker entitled "Cherie and the Intriguing plot to be ambassador for London's Olympic bid"

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

" i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

iii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

- 2 -

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party"

The article alleges that I insisted on the idea of being involved in the Olympic bid and "pushed hard for it" at a meeting at the Reform Club. This is totally untrue and I understand that David Welch made this clear to your reporters. As such it is in clear breach of the Code.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy. I should point out to you that Linda McDougall, whose "biography" was not approved by me, cannot even get the name of my brother in law right in her book, as such she is a totally unreliable source. I can assure you that her account of my lack of interest in sport, as opposed to my lack of ability in sport, is as much fiction as her so called "biography". For example, not only did I attend the opening and closing ceremonies at the Commonwealth Games in Manchester but I spent an additional two full days watching the competition, followed up by two days watching the World Indoor Games in Birmingham earlier this year. I have also attended the London Marathon regularly and publicly from 1998 onwards as a cursory glance at your picture archives would show.

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of these inaccuracies and distortions as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA



The Editor,
The Mail on Sunday,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Sir,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Mail on Sunday of 1st June 2003 page 11 by a Jonathan Oliver entitled "...and a stylist for those bad Blair days."

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

"i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

i) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

ii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party"

- 2 -

The article refers to my failure to attend the optional part of the spouse programme at St Petersburg – a fashion show held on the morning of the 31st May. There was no “mystery” surrounding this. The fashion show was optional, and I explained to Mrs Putina when I saw her the night before that I was feeling jet lagged and she was happy to offer that I could miss the optional part of the programme. As I had been travelling on three separate flights from midnight Thursday 29th UK time until 2pm UK time on the Friday and had gone straight into a six hour official programme with only a 30 minute break to change my clothes, it is perhaps unsurprising I was a little tired. There was thus no “mystery” and the suggestion that there was a “rift” between myself and Mrs Putina are completely untrue. We have an excellent relationship developed from our many meetings. Had your correspondent bothered to check the facts, this would have become apparent.

As for the suggestion that Andre Suard’s presence in the accommodation had any significance this is rubbish. It is pointless taking someone to do your hair during a trip and then accommodating them half an hour away. The nature of Mr Suard’s role on the trip necessitates his presence near me and its significance is no more and no less than that.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of these inaccuracies and distortions as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA



The Editor,
The Evening Standard,
ANL
2 Derry Street
London W8 5TT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Madam,

Re Press Complaints Commission Code of Practice

I am writing to you to complain about the material breaches of the PCC Code contained in the article in the Evening Standard of 28th May 2003 page 17 by a Joe Murphy entitled "The Unhappy House at Number 10."

I understand that as Editor you are primarily responsible for ensuring that your newspaper complies with the Code. The Code itself provides

"Editors and publishers must ensure that the Code is observed rigorously not only by their staff but also by anyone who contributes to their publications"

and

"It is essential to the workings of an agreed code that it be honoured not only to the letter but in the full spirit. The Code should not be interpreted so narrowly as to compromise its commitment to respect the rights of the individual, nor so broadly that it prevents publication in the public interest."

Article 1 Accuracy provides

" i) Newspapers and periodicals must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted material including pictures.

ii) Whenever it is recognised that a significant inaccuracy, misleading statement or distorted report has been published, it must be corrected promptly and with due prominence.

iii) An apology must be published whenever appropriate.

iv) Newspapers, whilst free to be partisan, must distinguish clearly between comment, conjecture and fact

v) A newspaper or periodical must report fairly and accurately the outcome of an action for defamation to which it has been a party"

- 2 -

The article contained a series of total and significant inaccuracies and gave a distorted picture based on conjecture masquerading as unattributed fact. As such it is in clear breach of the Code.

In particular it refers to a series of incidents said to involve myself and Ms Fiona Millar at No 10 which are inaccurate and untrue. In the first place I was not "ordered" by Alastair Campbell to produce a record of my emails whether in the presence of Ms Millar or at all. Secondly there was no "extraordinary confrontation" between myself and Ms Millar whether two days after the alleged email incident or at all. The whole incident is a complete fabrication and both Ms Millar and Jonathan Powell can confirm this never took place.

I have not commented on everything else in the article that is incorrect but my failure to do so should not be taken as acceptance of its accuracy.

I ask that you respond to my request for justification of these inaccuracies and distortions as soon as possible and that you amend your electronic database and library cuttings with a suitable note to reflect my position on the matter and confirm that this has been done.

Yours

Cherie Booth QC

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Dear Mr Dacre

Richard Littlejohn is completely wrong to say that my Lent talk on Restorative Justice ("A get-out-of-jail-free Cherie Card" – 16th March) means that anyone guilty of a serious crime "can avoid a prison sentence if they agree to meet their victim and apologise". I certainly did not make any such claim. Nor do I believe it.

On the contrary, I stressed in my talk that serious and persistent criminals must be punished by a jail sentence both to signal society's disgust at their actions and to protect the public. What's more, in the course of my work as a judge, I frequently send people to prison.

What I did say, however, is that while prison is right as a punishment, it too often alone doesn't alter long- term behaviour and suggested that restorative justice can help. Research has shown that criminals who are confronted by the effects of their crime, by for example having to apologise to their victims, have a lower re-offending rate.

Griffin Building, Gray's Inn	Tel: +44 (0) 20 7404 3447	e-mail: matrix@matrixlaw.co.uk	DX400
London WC1R 5LN	Fax: +44 (0) 20 7404 3448	Web: www.matrixlaw.co.uk	Chancery Lane

Can I suggest that in future Richard Littlejohn acquaints himself with the facts before bursting into print? In the meantime, I should be grateful if you would print a retraction, explaining my real views to your readers. To assist you, I am enclosing a copy of the talk in question.

Yours sincerely



Cherie Booth QC

Mr Paul Dacre

Griffin Building, Gray's Inn	Tel: +44 (0) 20 7404 3447	e-mail: matrix@matrixlaw.co.uk	DX400
London WC1R 5LN	Fax: +44 (0) 20 7404 3448	Web: www.matrixlaw.co.uk	Chancery Lane

Dear Mr Dacre

I refer to the first item in the Ephraim Hardcastle diary column in today's *Daily Mail*.

It asserts, without any evidence whatsoever, that the Prime Minister and Mrs Blair tipped off *The Sun* that Tessa Jowell would be present on Monday night to see Kathryn Blair directing a play for her school. The fact is that on Monday the DCMS press office gave out information to any journalist who enquired about Ms Jowell's engagements during the week, including her planned attendance at the Unicorn Theatre.

Your assertion – I repeat, without any evidence whatsoever - is not only totally untrue but offensive in the extreme. The Prime Minister and Mrs Blair continue to regard the privacy of all their children as a matter of vital importance.

I don't expect you to publish this letter, but please place it on file.

Yours sincerely

Tom Kelly

