From: Sent: To: Subject: Anthony Rush [rush_aj@ 03 September 2010 12:49 Fitchie, Andrew Re: Norwegian Silence

We've served the RTN

Sent using my BlackBerry[®] from Orange

This message is confidential and may contain privileged information. If you are not the addressee (or responsible for delivery of the message to the addressee) any disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and then delete it. No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this message or attachments. It is your responsibility to scan for viruses.

BoW Tel Mobile email <u>rush aj@</u>

-----Original Message-----From: "Fitchie, Andrew" <<u>Andrew.Fitchie@dlapiper.com</u>> Date: Fri, 3 Sep 2010 12:32:08 To: <<u>rush aj@</u> Subject: Norwegian Silence

Legally privileged and FOISA exempt

Tony

I am giving serious thought to the refusal to hand over the clandestine agreement. PB have a very heavy responsibility for where things are.

Proposition to discuss depending on Carl isle position:

1. Tie is invited by BSC in their Dervaird submission to apply for specific implement as a normal means of unlocking contractual impasse.

2. Tie issues an RTN on the clandestine agreement - but the remedy sought is not disclosure but a full explanation of why the agreement was entered into, how it has been used and what it has generated.

3. Tie makes simultaneous application under specific implement to the court for disclose of the document itself on the grounds that:

4.the non disclosure of the document is a breach which should be rectified and at no cost - other than photocopying- to BSC. Its existence is admitted and no confidentiality is asserted.

5.tie requires to understand and is entitles to information on all Permitted Variations on an Open Book basis. The BSC- SDS clandestine agreement deals with payment for design issues. Non disclosure is a failure on Open Book commitment.

6. The audit provision requires to be complied with and the agreement is within the ambit of tie's audit on BSC management of SDS

7.RTNs are in play in respect of which the designers' performance is central and tie is entitled to know what BSC have agreed with SDS regarding design development.

8.Tie is publicly accountable and has reason to believe that services paid for with public funds may have manipulated to negate best value and conceal poor contractual performance.9. Tie wish to have the agreement to assess whether or not its interests have been damaged by delictual collusion and/or a possible Probited Act.

Views?

А

Andrew Fitchie Partner DLA Piper Scotland LLP T: -M: -F: -

This email is from DLA Piper Scotland LLP.

The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. They may not be disclosed to or used by or copied in any way by anyone other than the intended recipient. If this e mail is received in error, please contact DLA Piper Scotland LLP on +44 (0) 8700 111111 quoting the name of the sender and the email address to which it has been sent and then delete it.

Please note that neither DLA Piper Scotland LLP nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

DLA Piper Scotland LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland (registered number SO300365), which provides services from offices in Scotland. A list of members is open for inspection at its registered office and principal place of business Rutland Square, Edinburgh, EH1 2AA. Partner denotes member of a limited liability partnership.

DLA Piper Scotland LLP is regulated by the Law Society of Scotland and is a member of DLA Piper, an international legal practice, the members of which are separate and distinct legal entities. For further information, please refer to <u>www.dlapiper.com</u>.