

SHQ - Warren, Bob

From: SHQ - Holland, P (CFO)
Sent: 21 July 2009 08:30
To: SHQ - Warren, Bob
Subject: Re: Burns

Will call at 9

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: SHQ - Warren, Bob
To: SHQ - Holland, P (CFO)
Sent: Tue Jul 21 08:13:27 2009
Subject: Re: Burns

Peter

Will be with papers at 9 but can talk anytime. Andy kay wants to speak to me as well
Bob

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: SHQ - Holland, P (CFO)
To: SHQ - Warren, Bob
CC: 'max@winterbottom.co.uk'
Sent: Tue Jul 21 07:32:11 2009
Subject: Re: Burns

Bob what time can we talk on the phone this morning?
Peter

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

-----Original Message-----

From: SHQ - Warren, Bob
To: SHQ - Holland, P (CFO)
Sent: Mon Jul 20 17:55:22 2009
Subject: Burns

Peter

Have had a discussion today with CC O'Toole about Mr. Burns. He has received a missive from him accusing him of being disingenuous and refusing to speak to Matt Lucas from LEP, as a result he replied accusing Mr. Burns of being outrageous and also had a telephone conversation with CC Driver which he has subsequently had to retract part of as he told CC Driver that he had had no contact with any Matt but subsequently recalled a conversation with a Matthew from the Lancashire Evening Post which he had not connected.

Interestingly he told me that Matthew had said that they had popped printing Mr. Burns' allegations in view of their content - one avenue less.

He said he was not prepared to tolerate Mr. Burns and that a resolution had to be found and suggested that we had a meeting with all interested parties and mentioned You, Max, Andy Kay me and him and then went on to add Thompsons, FBU and Burns as he represents FSV.

He said he would be sending an email with the request on it.

He stated he did not think that Mr. Burns would be so forceful in front of the people he is accusing and that if the service has made mistakes it must own up to them. (I do

not share that view and believe this would be giving him an undeserved victory) I stated that I did not think we had made mistakes and that only when we had responded robustly to Thompsons, enclosing an example of Mr. Burns emails did it appear they thought better of utilising him in the vanguard of their case. Subsequently they had via Steve Harman put feelers out about individual settlements. I said I had reacted positively to this approach but I was still awaiting a concrete proposal from Steve. (I did not want to appear too eager as this would bolster their position.) I did say I had drawn a line at Burns being involved, which Steve quickly accepted. David seemed to like this development.

CC O'Toole accepted at this point that it might be better to leave Burns out of the equation, especially when I added in my view he has made up his role as representative of the FSV and his view is not shared by Thompsons and FBU.

At this point David told me that Steve and I think Kevin approached him after the CFA part 2 item to see if they could resolve the situation with Chairman and Vice Chairman to which David had replied he would not have a meeting without service representation. He told me they had said that Burns was a bully in the service and did not speak for them or Thompsons. I told David I had had discussions with Steve Harman and whilst he had made the same points to me at no time had he told me he was going to approach the Chairman about this. He had said he needed a get to know you session in their new capacities as Chair and Vice Chair but not that he was going to raise the injury pensions issue.

I agreed we had to have a resolution and if leaving him without his pension was not an option I said we could not reinstate, then the only recourse was legal and having repeated Mr. Burns about the benefits information we had received, we did not expect an answer - then this was the avenue we were looking at. (Either LFRS taking proceedings or National Fraud Initiative if not both)

David said he had expected him when confronted with the information about his benefits to withdraw, I agreed but expressed the view he was a wounded animal and these were his last throes.

I undertook to provide a synopsis for any future meeting that is arranged of the contradictions and alterations in Burns position (with a view to the document or a separate document finding its way to CC Driver to show the lies that have been presented to help CC O'Toole's position - I did not say this to David)

I am mindful that this is tricky territory but an agreed Service/CFA position might be useful to then follow up with Thompsons/ FBU /Individuals. Also if email does arrive from David then need to consider whether to extend invite to Audit Commission (NFI) and LCC representatives both pensions and legal Bob