

IN THE MATTER OF THE
LEVESON INQUIRY INTO
CULTURE, PRACTICE AND
ETHICS OF THE PRESS

Witness: H Mills
Response to Letter from John
Ferriter
Exhibits: None
Dated: 14th November 2012

WITNESS STATEMENT OF HEATHER ANNE MILLS

I, Heather Anne Mills, of
 will say as follows in addition to my previous statements dated earlier this
year:

1. I have been sent a letter from the Inquiry, dated 31st October 2012, concerning an unsolicited statement which has been sent in to them by Mr John Ferriter. They have also sent me extracts of Mr Ferriter's statement which I understand to be paragraphs 5-9 inclusive.
2. I am unsure why I was not shown the whole statement that he submitted. Obviously where my statement refers to the evidence of Mr Ferriter, it only relates to those paragraphs I have seen.
3. I have been informed by the solicitors for the Inquiry that they believe that John Ferriter's letter calls my evidence into question because he asserts that I played him a voicemail in 2007, which had been left on my voicemail service in 2001.
4. John Ferriter was my agent at William Morris Agency in Los Angeles from approximately 2002 to 2009. I appeared on Dancing with the Stars in 2007, which is the period during which Mr Ferriter is saying that I played him the voicemail from 2001.
5. I have three big issues with this. The first is that it is simply untrue. The second is that, even if it wasn't untrue, it wouldn't be relevant to the Inquiry as the event took place after Mr Morgan had bragged about having heard my private voicemail (I believe that this is an attempt by Mr Morgan's camp to muddy the waters around his evasive evidence). The third, and most disappointing, is that having volunteered to give evidence, provided two written statements and appeared in person to back that evidence up orally, I am being called upon once more to justify my evidence as a result of this transparent attempt to discredit me.

The Truth of Mr Ferriter's Assertion

6. It is my understanding that Mr Ferriter was (and possibly still is now) Piers Morgan's agent and was instrumental in assisting Piers Morgan with securing his current position at CNN, replacing Larry King. He is, therefore, financially and professionally linked with Mr Morgan, whose evidence I was invited to refute by the Inquiry.

7. The history of my evidence before the Inquiry is that Mr Morgan bragged in a news paper article (published in the Daily Mail in October 2006) entitled, "I'm sorry, Macca , for introducing you to this monster" to have been played a voicemail which had been left on my voicemail system:

"Stories soon emerged that the marriage was in trouble - at one stage I was played a tape of a message Paul had left for Heather on her mobile phone."

8. He refused to say how he had heard it, and has refused to explain who provided him with it. His answers were so evasive and ambiguous that they left open the suggestion that I had played the message to him. At no time, I understand, was he directly asked whether it was me that played it to him.

9. It was because of this that the Inquiry invited me to give evidence, which I did in January of this year. My evidence was clear (see paragraph 17 below), and certainly dispelled the suggestion that I had anything to do with him hearing the message. This evidence has put him under pressure once more to disclose how he came to hear the message, which he has to date refused to do.

10. I can only assume that, given this difficult position for Mr Morgan, Mr Ferriter has been put under some sort of pressure by him, or CNN, or persons unknown to me to produce this unsolicited statement in attempt to discredit the evidence that I gave, and so assist Mr Morgan and bolster his evidence in some way.

11. It is, to me, telling that Mr Ferriter is so vague as to the actual details of the event at which I supposedly played him a voicemail message. I can categorically say that I have never played John Ferriter (nor authorised him to listen to) a voicemail message.

The Relevance of Mr Ferriter's Assertion

12. While I steadfastly deny ever having played a voicemail to Mr Ferriter, I believe

that, even if I had, this would not have any relevance with regard to Mr Morgan's having listened to my voicemail, as Mr Morgan published his article admitting it in 2006, a whole year before Mr Ferriter says I played it to him.

My Previous Evidence

13. The Inquiry and the police are aware of the identity of the journalist who played my private voicemail message to Piers Morgan. Due to the ongoing criminal investigation, I am unable to say who this journalist is.
14. I have also voluntarily furnished the Inquiry with private and personal evidence of the recording I played to John Ferriter at the meeting he recalls. I am unable to disclose further the contents in this statement, as they are sealed under a penal notice, but they do not relate to voicemails or phone hacking or the ethics of the press. In fact, they show that the meeting and recording referred to by Mr Ferriter fall well outside the Terms of Reference of this Inquiry.
15. Despite that, I am disappointed that, having been invited to give evidence before the Inquiry, and done so voluntarily, I have now been called into question and asked to stand by my evidence as if I was some sort of miscreant, when it was my private voicemail which was accessed by the media. All this because Mr Morgan has failed to answer the simple question of how it was he came to hear my private voicemail messages left for me in 2001.
16. It is unfortunate that I am having to relive once more what was a very difficult time for me. I was going through the personal torment of an acrimonious divorce, which was being played out daily in the country's newspapers and television, online, and even abroad. Additionally I was trying to avoid the sort of vitriolic journalism, like the article referred to above, that Mr Morgan appears to specialise in, while all the time the articles were pouring forth, fuelled by information gleaned illegally over the years from my voicemail.
17. The evidence given by me in my First Witness Statement in January, at Paragraph 11, was as follows:

"I have never played these messages to anyone and, apart from being in my voice mailbox, I have never had a recording of them. I never took a recording and I no

longer have them or any access to them. The messages were deleted in 2001 when they happened."

18. That continues to be my evidence. Apart from their original storage on my voicemail messaging system, these messages were never stored by me, or anyone working for me, or (to my knowledge) anyone close to or friendly with me. I never instructed anyone to make or store a recording of them and I never authorised anybody to do so.
19. To the very best of my knowledge and belief, they were deleted in 2001 once I had listened to them, and I never subsequently had access to them, personally or through anyone else. I cannot stress enough that there is no way I played them to anyone.
20. I am heartily disappointed that the Inquiry appears to be allowing itself to be manipulated by unsolicited statements of questionable origin and which display quite transparent financial motives. I hope that this genre of statements made from the safety of foreign jurisdictions, where the makers have not made themselves available in person to the Inquiry to support their evidence orally, will be given appropriate weight and that they will not distract the Inquiry from its difficult and important task.
21. I cannot help feeling that I could have been spared having to revisit this had the Inquiry simply asked Mr Morgan, "Did Heather play you the voicemail?" as well as "Who played you the voicemail?" I suppose this is something that, with the benefit of hindsight, the Inquiry might have asked.
22. I have told the Police formally, and the Inquiry informally, the name of the person who I believe intercepted my voicemail messages in 2001. Because of the ongoing criminal investigation (through Operation Weeting and related operations), the Police and the Inquiry have not released those details, and have asked me to refrain from doing the same publicly.
23. I have honoured this and will continue to do so in the hope that those responsible will be brought to justice.
24. It is regrettable that Mr Morgan has chosen to hide behind a veil of protecting his "informants", particularly at the expense of a clear and transparent line of accountability for the illegal interception of voicemail communications, and that he

has not embraced the opportunity to assist Lord Justice Leveson and the Police with their investigations. I hope that in some way the truth will prevail, despite his reluctance for it to do so.

I believe that the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true.

HEATHER MILLS

14th November 2012