

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL
NOTES OF A MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 10 MAY 1993
AT 9 BUCKINGHAM GATE AT 2.45.PM

Present: Attorney General
Mr Michael Mates MP
S. J. Wooler

1. The meeting was at the request of Mr Mates. He reminded the Attorney General of his previously expressed concerns about the SFO handling of the Polly Peck inquiry. He found last week's events appalling but not surprising. Mr Mates had been kept informed of developments in the case and Nadir had long been convinced that he would not receive a fair trial; incidents approximately two weeks ago had reinforced that belief. The police together with the trustee in bankruptcy had visited Nadir and removed all his papers including those legally privileged. Mr Mates was astounded that this could happen and the apparent lack of remedy.
2. Mr Mates had received numerous overtures from Tony Scrivener QC since his December meeting with Attorney General to the effect that 'something has got to be done and considered that only the Attorney General had the necessary locus. Scrivener had felt inhibited because a direct approach by the defence would embarrass Attorney General. Mr Mates felt the time had come to raise the matter again with Attorney General.
3. The Attorney General said that each issue previously raised by Mr Mates had been examined by himself and his predecessor very carefully and had been dealt with satisfactorily. He cited the assertion that the previous Attorney had misled Mr Mates by an assurance that no police inquiries had been possible in TRNC. That had been categorically refuted. Nonetheless it was proper for Mr Mates to raise any further concerns.
4. Mr Mates summarised the three main concerns recently brought to his attention:
 - (a) The removal of papers by the police as above.
 - (b) The previous Attorney General had assured him that the SFO had not colluded with the Inland Revenue (a Mr Allcock) in setting up the Polly Peck Inquiry. Allcock (a Grade 3 in Revenue) had now been found responsible for many irregularities within inland Revenue. He had disappeared and was being sought. However, Panorama had been able to interview him and he was said to have admitted that in 1990 the SFO had colluded with the Revenue and the Administrators of the Trustees with the specific purpose of bringing down Polly Peck. Reverting to this issue later in the meeting Mr Mates said that Panorama had also interviewed a representative of the Greek Cypriot Government. He had acknowledged an interest in bringing down Polly Peck. The revenues brought to TRNC by Polly Peck companies supported its economy and afforded it a far stronger bargaining position in UN led negotiations over the future of Cyprus than was in fact justified.
 - (c) Mr Mates had also learned of intelligence agency involvement in an approach to Nadir with an SFO proposal that proceedings would be dropped provided there was an assurance from Nadir of 'no comeback' i.e. no litigation.

This information had originally come to Mr Mates from Nadir via Anthony Scrivener. He had not initially appreciated the intelligence agency involvement but subsequently saw correspondence which he considered confirmed the information. The SFO emissary was Lord Erskine of Rerrick, previously a member of the security services, who was known to Mr Mates. The correspondence consisted of a letter from a person at Jacob Rothschild's bank to Lord Erskine (on bank paper) and his reply. The letter did not specifically refer to an approach by SFO but the reply from Lord Erskine confirmed that he was 'to meet Nadir to discuss aspects of Polly Peck'. It was Nadir/Scrivener who had fleshed out the details for him. Nadir had informed him that

he Nadir had met Lord Erskine acting on behalf of the SFO; unwisely he had gone to the meeting alone.

5. Mr Mates said he had met Nadir on several occasions and been briefed. He believes that Nadir does wish to return to UK because he is desperate to clear his name. For his part he does not know whether Nadir is guilty or innocent but remains worried about the conduct of the case. He is also anxious not to become too deeply involved when his lack of direct knowledge or legal expertise could make him simply an intermediary. He invited the Attorney General to see Anthony Scrivener so that he could amplify the complaints direct. Mr Nadir's many complaints had been summarised in a weekend press statement. It had been drafted by Mark Rogerson (Nadir's publicity consultant) who was known to Mr Mates. He (Mr Mates) was satisfied that the complaints could be substantiated. The Attorney General said that any approach from Scrivener should be in writing. In the meantime he would consider the points raised.
6. The Attorney General inquired in relation to an outstanding issue (a complaint by Mr Mates about the improper conduct of the SFO Folly Peck case controller in another matter) whether Mr Mates had obtained the consent of his acquaintance (who initiated the complaint) to divulge his identity. The individual was unwilling and Mr Mates accepted that that issue must be regarded as closed.
7. The Attorney General said he would look carefully at the points as he had done in relation to the points previously raised by Mr Mates.

S.J. WOOLER
12 May 1993