

---

**From:** Alan Coyle  
**Sent:** 09 August 2010 14:24  
**To:** Hugh Dunn; Ailie Wilson  
**Subject:** FW: Latest adjudication - LEGALLY PRIVILIGED, STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL AND FOISA EXEMPT, PREPARED IN CONTEMPLATION OF LITIGATION

FYI.

I do not know where this leaves tie. We'll find out more from RJ tomorrow but I think this is a big feather in the cap of BSC and places doubt on the quality of the legal advice tie are getting.

Alan Coyle | Financial Services | Corporate Finance Team (Edinburgh Trams) | Level 2/6 Waverley Court | 4 East Market St EH8 8BG | [alan.coyle@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:alan.coyle@edinburgh.gov.uk) |  
Phone 0131 [REDACTED] Mobile [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Richard Jeffrey [mailto:Richard.Jeffrey@tie.ltd.uk]  
**Sent:** 09 August 2010 13:01  
**To:** Dave Anderson; Marshall Poulton; Donald McGougan; Nick Smith; Alan Coyle  
**Cc:** Steven Bell; david\_mackay@tiscali.co.uk; Mandy Haeburn-Little  
**Subject:** Latest adjudication - LEGALLY PRIVILIGED, STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL AND FOISA EXEMPT, PREPARED IN CONTEMPLATION OF LITIGATION

LEGALLY PRIVILIGED, STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL AND FOISA EXEMPT, PREPARED IN CONTEMPLATION OF LITIGATION

Dear all,

Last night at 9pm we received the ruling from Lord Dervaird on the dispute over our ability to instruct Infraco to proceed with the works under certain circumstances. This dispute was raised by Infraco utilising one example (Murrayfield Underpass structure). Lord Dervaird has ruled in favour of Infraco in this case. This is surprising, contrary to all the advice we have had, and needless to say very disappointing. It also highlights the risks of legal disputes.

The full details of the ruling are, as always, high level and complex, and need to be read carefully, and I will send a copy to Nick Smith under legal privilege, along with various relevant comments.

Important points to note are:

- The ruling is specific to the circumstances of the dispute
- This decision only covers the position where it is agreed that a Notified Departure exists and no estimate has been agreed to cover this notified departure. In this situation Lord Dervaird holds that Clause 80.13 cannot be the basis for an instruction to proceed, that in such circumstances clause 80.15 should be used. This would mean putting every change notice into the dispute procedure.
- He does not rule on the use of Clause 34.1 in the situation where we disagree that a notified departure has occurred.
- Extending the adjudicator's logic would suggest that, in the event that we agree that a notified departure has occurred, but no estimate has been received, we should use clause 80.15 as above. This needs careful consideration.
- McGrigors (who led this one for us) do not consider Lord Dervaird's reasoning to be compelling. His approach is narrow and fails to recognise that if Infraco did proceed in accordance with a direction under Clause 80.13 or 34.1 they would be protected by 34.3. The link from Clause 34.3 to Clause 80 does not disapply the protection contained within Clause 34.3.

- Lord Dervaird has not chosen to address the commercial absurdity arguments made by McGrigors on our behalf in relation to this specific Dispute.

As always with adjudications, the adjudicator has narrowly examined the question posed, and not necessarily considered the wider consequences of their ruling (they are not required to). Despite the fact that we disagree with some of the reasoning and believe the consequences of the ruling simply create more questions, we do not, at this stage propose to challenge it through the courts.

We have this morning agreed a way forward in discussion with our advisors, and I will discuss this with you when we meet tomorrow.

Had we been successful in responding to this Dispute, it would have provided us with a very strong case going forward. The fact that the ruling was in Infraco's favour is a setback, but not to the extent that it changes our overall approach. As always, there are elements of the ruling, and of the evidence submitted by Infraco that will be used to feed our overall strategy, again I am happy to discuss this at our meeting tomorrow. As one door closes...

Happy to discuss by phone or in person today if you wish.

Regards

Richard

**Richard Jeffrey**  
*Chief Executive*

**Edinburgh Trams**  
*Citypoint*  
*65 Haymarket Terrace*  
*Edinburgh*  
*EH12 5HD*

Tel: (+44) (0)131 [REDACTED]  
Email: richard.jeffrey@tie.ltd.uk

**Find us online (click below):**



---

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.

---