

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL  
LEGALLY PRIVILEGED

The Leveson Inquiry

Witness Statement for Part 1, Module 1

---

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL WITNESS STATEMENT OF HUGH GRANT

---

I, Hugh Grant, C/o Collyer Bristow LLP, 4 Bedford Row, London, WC1R 4DF will say as follows:

Documents  
referred to

1. I am making this second supplementary statement in order to deal with a number of matters relating to the evidence I gave to the Inquiry on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2011 and to the response which has been provided by Associated Newspapers, both in terms of the evidence they have submitted (primarily from Liz Hartley, their in-house lawyer) and the submissions made on their behalf by their Counsel. I attach to this statement a small bundle of documents Marked HGSS 1.
2. I have done this because the newspaper group has gone to great lengths to criticise the evidence I gave to the Inquiry, as opposed to merely disputing those aspects which they believe might have been mistaken. The two aspects in relation to which they have done this are; first, my comments about the reporting of the birth of my child at the Portland Hospital in October 2011 and secondly, my comments about the article which appeared in the Mail on Sunday in February 2007 concerning my alleged 'affair' with a 'plummy-voiced' film executive. I deal with them in turn below.

**The Portland Hospital Story**

3. The background to this episode is given in my First Supplementary Statement, dated 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2011, so I do not need to repeat it here.

Documents  
referred to

4. Although I have dealt in some detail in that statement with my concerns about the reporting and general press activity surrounding the birth of my daughter and the treatment of her mother, Tinglan Hong, there are a number of features which still cause me considerable concern, particularly in the light of the evidence which Associated Newspapers has recently submitted.
5. For example, in seeking to defend the persistent hounding of Tinglan at the time of the birth and afterwards, Ms Hartley says in her supplemental witness statement that, having been contacted by someone from within my "celebrity circle" (paragraph 3) they obtained Tinglan's address through the work of one of their journalists (paragraph 4). I find it hard to believe that someone from within my circle of friends would have disclosed this information as only a very small, trusted group were aware of it. Having had the "tip-off" a journalist is said simply to have turned up and asked the current resident at Tinglan's former flat about Tinglan's whereabouts. She says that he was given the details of the lettings agency in charge of the property by the current resident's girlfriend. However, what Ms Hartley did not explain is the fact that at no stage did this journalist disclose the fact that he was a journalist from the Daily Mail. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this unsuspecting new tenant has confirmed that had he done so, she would not have provided such details. I attach a letter from her explaining what happened.
6. Ms Hartley then says (paragraph 5) that the journalist telephoned the lettings agency and was provided with Ms Hong's private mobile number (although the name of the person at the agency to whom the journalist spoke is not revealed). My assistant has now called that agency to verify this and was told that it is not their policy to disclose the mobile phone numbers of their tenants, whether to former tenants, utility companies or journalists. This is not surprising as it would appear to be a clear breach of the Data Protection Act. A third party obtaining or procuring the disclosure of such information from the lettings agency in this way and subsequently using it, would appear to be making further breaches of the Data Protection Act.
7. In both her statement and her evidence, Ms Hartley referred to the number of phone calls made to Tinglan's mobile phone by Daily Mail journalists. I understand that the newspaper group do not

Page 1

Documents  
referred to

regard repeated calls to a woman who has just given birth and is plainly unwilling to speak to the press as in any way inappropriate or intrusive, but Tinglan certainly felt it was and that is why she even had to change her number on the 21 October.

8. Another matter of concern relates to the name which Tinglan used when she booked into the hospital. She is a private person and had no wish for publicity surrounding the birth, so rather than using her first name Tinglan, she used the name "Sophie". The inquiry will recall that when I was asked in evidence how Daily Mail journalists had managed to discover the name which Tinglan had used, I speculated that it must have come from a leak within the hospital itself, as I couldn't think of an alternative, given that it was only known to very few people indeed.
9. Ms Hartley says in paragraphs 8 and 9 of her statement that in fact this information was obtained by a reporter who got it from the Westminster Register Office. This office is responsible by law for keeping records of all births etc. in the area, even before the baby is registered by the parents themselves. Ms Hartley says that the reporter was told by the Register Office that although there had been no registration by either myself or Tinglan, they did have a record that a child had been born to a woman called "Sophie" Hong at the Portland Hospital on 26 September 2011.
10. This may be how the information was obtained. But this was obviously private information, as any journalist would have known. Clearly, the whole point of registering under the name "Sophie" with the hospital was to try and protect Tinglan's privacy (as well as the baby's) from exactly the sort of unwarranted media attention which occurred. As the letter we received from the Portland Hospital confirms, this information would have formed part of Tinglan's confidential medical records. The birth notification sent by the hospital to the Register Office also forms part of the medical records (there is a copy of it in her notes from the hospital). All of this must have been obvious to the newspaper's journalists, news editor and lawyers.
11. Furthermore, as I understand it, obtaining or procuring the disclosure of such private information in this way may well be a breach of the Data Protection Act. I attach letters from the Superintendent Registrar at Westminster and the Registrar General

Pages 2 to 3

Pages 4 to 6

Documents  
referred to

explaining the position.

12. I have already given evidence about the volume of emails and phone calls my UK assistant received from another Mail journalist, Ben Todd, following the birth of my daughter. This happened despite my having made it very clear that I did not want to make any public comment. In her evidence Ms Hartley claimed that they were neither excessive nor harassing. That is certainly not how my experienced assistant, Ms Sara Woodhatch, viewed it.
13. In particular, she tells me that there was one phone call she had with Mr Todd on 25<sup>th</sup> October when, in trying to persuade her to say more than "I have nothing on this", he talked about how much worse it would be if the story were to find its way in to the hands of a notoriously ruthless photographic agency.

#### The Plummy-Voiced Film Executive Story

14. Again, I have already described the gist of the story surrounding the publication of an article in the Mail on Sunday in February 2007 about an alleged 'affair' with a 'plummy-voiced' film executive in my original statement.
15. When I complained about the article back in 2007, the newspaper sought to justify its story. I was forced to commence legal proceedings for libel. They even stated in their formal Court documents responding to my claim that they were intending to defend the action I had brought. However, very shortly after my starting proceedings the newspaper completely caved, agreeing to damages, all my legal fees and a statement being read out in Court admitting that the allegation was entirely untrue. I attach a copy of this statement. Pages 7 to 10
16. At the time I also released a press statement saying the following (without any objection from Associated Newspapers):  
*"I took this action because I was fired of the Daily Mail and Mail on Sunday papers publishing almost entirely fictional articles about my private life for their own financial gain.*  
  
*I'm also hoping that this statement in court might remind people that the so-called 'close friends' or 'close sources' on which these stories claim to be based almost never exist."*

Documents  
referred to

17. When I was questioned at the Inquiry about the account I gave of this episode in my original witness statement, I said that the only conceivable source I could think of for the story were a large number of voice messages left on my mobile phone at the time by a lady working for the producer of my most recent film. They were all business calls arranging phone calls and meetings with the producer, but they were often jokey in style. She does not work for Warner Brothers, but the film was a Warner Brothers film. She did not go to Cheltenham and Cambridge but she is English and does have a plummy voice. We were never in any way romantically linked but her messages were often left late at night due to the time difference between Los Angeles and London. (I was actually in America for much of this time but using my UK mobile, which was left on UK time. Hence, ordinary US daytime messages from this lady regarding ordinary daytime meetings etc. would have been audibly time stamped as late at night in UK time). I also had in mind what Paul McMullan had said to me during the course of our conversation about Associated Newspapers' involvement (like other newspapers) in this kind of activity. Nevertheless, I accepted entirely that this was of course speculation on my part as only the newspaper has the documents or evidence on which the story was prepared. I never saw anything in the legal proceedings.
18. The attack which then followed on me by Associated Newspapers within hours of this evidence is already known to the Inquiry. I was accused of lying on oath, which, as I understand it, is the same as an accusation of perjury. This is a matter which Mr Sherborne (representing me and the other Core Participant Victims) has referred to on a number of occasions and I am hoping he will be given an opportunity to raise it properly with the newspaper when this matter is dealt with. However, I should say that although I was (and am) angry at this accusation of lying, I am not making this statement because of some personal vendetta against this newspaper group. I am making it because it is symptomatic of the bullying treatment which some newspapers have displayed towards those who question their behaviour. The Inquiry has often said that this is part of the culture and practices which it wishes to investigate. Clearly, this is something which a number of the Core Participant Victims have mentioned in their evidence and I believe

Documents  
referred to

other members of the public have suffered as well.

19. There is one more point on this issue. In the press statement which Associated Newspapers released immediately after my evidence, they defended their original article, despite their acceptance in 2007 that it was entirely false. They claimed that the story had come from a "source" who had heard it from Jemima Khan, my girlfriend at the time. As the inquiry is aware, Jemima immediately denied this and has sworn a Witness Statement saying this is not possible, as the first she even knew of any 'plummy-voiced' woman was when she read the article itself.

20. Despite this, in the supplementary statement which was submitted several weeks later by Associated Newspapers, Ms Hartley repeats this claim. In paragraph 22 she says that "the source of the story was a confidential contact of Sharon Feinstein, a freelance journalist who often works with Katie Nicholl, the diary editor of The Mail on Sunday. That contact provided the information contained in the story. The contact is, I am informed, a source who Ms Feinstein was aware spoke regularly to Jemima Khan". No more details are given. This is of course implies that Jemima also lied under oath in her statement to the inquiry.

21. Months previous to this story, Katie Nichole had somehow obtained the email address of Jemima. Despite the fact that her approaches were usually met either with polite "no comments", she was in the habit of emailing her to ask her for comment on stories she wanted to run. In this case, despite their claim that the source for the Plummy Voiced woman story was someone close to Jemima and despite the fact that the article was full of contentious assertions which ultimately cost the paper dear in the courts, no approach to Jemima was made.

22. Lastly the woman who I referred to in my original statement and who was leaving me messages at the time, Patricia Owen, has also submitted a witness statement in it, she confirms that she did leave a number of messages on my UK mobile at that time. She confirms that these did refer to meetings and they are the sort of messages which a 'stranger' who did not know the context of our relationship might misconstrue as being a little flirtatious, as I have explained. She also demonstrates that she has what some people might call a 'peeth' or 'plummy' voice.

Pages 11 to 12

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

DATED the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of February 2012

SIGNED: 