

[Print](#)[Close](#)

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)

Sent: 14 March 2015 07:11:42

To: aidan.ce@outlook.com

A

Thanks v much for coming down yesterday I had a great deal of fun. And I 100% insist that I will repay £68.40. The tale of my Barclays woes will go up later today, that was then compounded by PC issues ( I blame Microsoft) and so no email until now.

I hope we have agreed that we instruct lawyers to "drop hands". That is to say case is dropped and neither of us really cares about the stock, just leave it at Shit & Co. But if you want it you can have it.

That's all we put in writing. What we agree verbally is that I reinstate old pieces but without keywords so they will just disappear into old internet land, is that I do a short WRN piece which is negative. You then put underneath that words like "I have dropped my legal action against Tom becuae I actually support a free press and free speech. Because Tom supports free speech he is giving me a right of reply.

You say yep we made a few errors in the early days but this is where WRN is now.

step 2 we get what is happening at rangers trial out there in the way i described. You may not care about what folks think but flks who care about you will care about how you are perceived. I would like to break this story & I know it will get picked up on. we can agree wording

step 3 is you do a 45 min talk with questions of 10 at UKI on april 18 which we video and broadcast. tak abit WRN if you wish but accepting that you will face some ridicule but you know that anyway Id likle you to talk about faith & money

if we are okay on this i guess we both tell lawyers what to do

t

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: [aidan.ce@outlook.com](mailto:aidan.ce@outlook.com)  
Sent: 14 March 2015 13:21:12  
To: Tom Winnifrith ([tomat49@gmail.com](mailto:tomat49@gmail.com))

Thanks Tom, I enjoyed it very much too

I've only just got up (bit if a hangover this morning and went back to bed!).

That's broadly what I think we agreed. However I may have misunderstood but I thought that we were leaving things as they are and that the existing stuff would drop off the radar. I hadn't understood that you are planning to replace stuff taken down which would then drop off the radar. I guess if all the stuff definitely drops off the radar then that could work (including stuff currently there), I just need to be sure that is how it works.

I need to speak to the lawyers to see how the legal agreement works. I guess we would both want it to be completely confidential so that no party can disclose it unless it is broken. All I need to really know is that, other than the one negative article that we both review and agree and my positive response which we both review and agree, you and Share Prophets will not comment on WRN negatively again. I'm sure a form of words that suits us both can be drafted.

Happy to speak to Bick and for you to break the story with agreed wording, providing that will not annoy the police or isn't a breach of my obligations as a witness.

OK on the investor show. How much ridicule are we talking about? What am I likely to be ridiculed about?

I am just driving up to Leeds but will be able to pick up emails later on.

Best  
A.

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)  
Sent: 16 March 2015 07:10:26  
To: aidan CE (aidan.ce@outlook.com)

Aiden

I cannot agree in writing to not comment on WRN again personally or for SP.  
What I said was that I will run the piece we agreed and I can give you my word and my word matters.

My word is that I am not going after you personally at all -indeed I want to run the article n you giving evidence for the queen v whyte as it shows you in a good light.. If WRN does something daft we are going to comment. But am I chasing you guys? No.

So we agree re court is a "drop hands", and we can run the article at same time.

As to the articles that were pulled what I intend is that they will reappear over time. But here will be no keywords so hard for google to find and no-one ever looks at old material. It is internet chip paper.

Not sure what time you get up but lets talk

t

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)

Sent: 17 March 2015 13:48:24

To: aidan CE (aidan.ce@outlook.com)

no probs phrase i suggest is "drop hands"

you understand I cannot agree never to write again but you also understand that  
you have my word as to what i shall do and that - i think we understand each other  
- is better than a piece of paper

t

Print

Close

---

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)

Sent: 19 March 2015 09:47:41

To: aidan CE (aidan.ce@outlook.com)

1 attachment

AEconclusion.docx (14.2 KB)

A

Life's tests. Having to fie a chef for doing a Clarkson on another chef. And then him squaring up to me as I got hom to leave the building. And that was just the start of it.

Anyhow:

a) attached is the article Id want to run but it awaits your half. If you want to write I can sub edit for you (grammar, etc) or just leave as is. Your call. You will get to inspect finished piece pre publication

b) where are we on getting lawyers to sort out terminating matters n court?

t

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: **aidan CE** (aidan.ce@outlook.com)  
Sent: 19 March 2015 11:27:53  
To: tomat49@gmail.com; s.ondhia@rfblegal.co.uk

Morning Tom

Just to confirm I'm not proceeding pursuant to our handshake. Lawyers will be in touch latest tomorrow to confirm drop hands wording. You will note we have not filed any further evidence which we would have had to do by 4pm yesterday.

Will be in touch later today/tomorrow morning

A.

[Print](#)[Close](#)

From: [aidan.ce@outlook.com](mailto:aidan.ce@outlook.com)

Sent: 20 March 2015 11:03:47

To: [tomat49@gmail.com](mailto:tomat49@gmail.com)

Morning Tom

Thanks for your draft article yesterday, which I think is very much in the spirit of what we discussed. So thanks for that. I will get my reply prepared over the weekend hopefully, certainly no later than Monday.

You should have the draft consent order dropping hands and the return of the memory stick to us (as you suggested, rather than Stitt and Co holding it at ad infinitum). We didn't cover the issue of costs, normally each side bears their own on the dropping of hands. You have a costs order against me, which obviously I would be grateful if I didn't have to pay. But we haven't agreed anything on this and I will do whatever you think is fair in this regard.

Just to recap on our handshake agreement so that we know where we are:

I will do a talk on Faith and Money at your investor show for approximately 30 minutes with approximately 10 minutes of questions. Not much of the talk, if any, will be about Worthington but it may come up in passing. You kindly said that I could go to the venue the night before to get a feel for it. As regards the format, the chairman will agree with me/you what questions can be asked. It would be difficult for me to talk about Worthington deals et cetera, for example. Ideally the questions would be restricted to the Faith and Money topic. But we can agree something sensible I'm sure. You also kindly said that there will be no cameras and that the video would not be published unless I agreed to it having had the chance to see it. Thanks also for your tips on speaking; I must say that I'm quite looking forward to it – as you say, it should be good practice. Particularly talking to an audience that may be unreceptive.

As regards our ongoing relationship, I hope that develops as well. Life is certainly very interesting and no doubt we've got lots more to discuss. In relation to future comment on Worthington, my understanding of our handshake is that you're not going after Worthington (or me) and that you do not expect to write on the subject "unless Worthington does something silly" and will refrain from using words like fraud. Obviously, in time, I would hope that Worthington completes the deals and does well for stakeholders for a whole raft of reasons – in particular enabling me to complete my book and get on with the important work that I really want to do. If that proves to be the case then I would hope that you would even, eventually, be supportive - but let's go one step at a time!

As regards the articles that have been taken down, you said that you would put them up again in about 7 to 9 months by which time they will be "Internet chip paper". Technically I can't formally agree to that (because it would imply that I agreed to mainstream media doing the same) but I won't oppose it, let's put it that way. Maybe come then you may not want to put it up because Worthington has been a stunning success – we live in hope!

I know that you may be under a bit of pressure from your "core support" to keep posting negatively about Worthington, so thanks for reassuring me that you will be able to resist that pressure by concentrating on new stories.

Finally, subject only to not annoying the police or breaching any obligations as a witness, I'm happy for you to quote me that I am a crown witness and have not been interviewed under caution. You will let me review anything first and I'm happy to meet David Bick with you if you like as well.

I think that pretty much sums things up. Let me know if I've got anything wrong. Here's looking forward to the investor show: I suspect my talk could generate something of a reaction – I hope a positive one!

Best regards

Aidan



[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: **aidan.ce@outlook.com**

Sent: 20 March 2015 17:04:39

To: tomat49@gmail.com

T

It appears that it has now all been signed with the lawyers re the official position. I'm paying the costs as ordered.

Our handshake deal as per this morning with me paying the existing costs order.

Have a good w/e

Best

A.

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)

Sent: 20 March 2015 17:11:29

To: aidan CE (aidan.ce@outlook.com)

same to you & many thanks, look forward to seeing your article

t

Print

Close

---

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)

Sent: 01 April 2015 09:07:41

To: aidan.ce@outlook.com; martha.gall@gmail.com;  
editorial@shareprophets.com

<http://www.shareprophets.com/views/11398/breaking-aiden-earley-of-worthington-to-speak-at-uk-investor-on-faith-money>

They will think it is an april fool. we know it is not! This way we maximise the impact of this.

Next up is your rangers status - will save that for the w/e - there is an easter read thru if you know what i mean

Martha and darren will be in touch on timings and logistics.

if you want to run your talk by someone ahead of the day I am in london 14th onwards

t

[Print](#)

[Close](#)

---

From: **aidan CE** (aidan.ce@outlook.com)

Sent: 01 April 2015 09:54:25

To: tomat49@gmail.com

Thanks Tom, very funny! That will definitely get them guessing!

I thought your cast on WRN was class yesterday - you outlined plan c if plan b doesn't work!!

A.

Print

Close

---

From: **aidan CE** (aidan.ce@outlook.com)  
Sent: 06 August 2015 13:16:35  
To: Tom Winnifrith (tomat49@gmail.com)

Hello Tom

I hope life is treating you well at the moment. I continue to persist in my efforts to pay past creditors etc, as we discussed when we met back in March. As you will no doubt recall from your days in business, building things up takes a lot of hard work and dedication and almost never goes as smoothly as we would all like.

I really enjoyed our meeting and thought we got on very well. You have your mission in life and I've got mine. I have therefore been quite upset by your apparent resumption of attacks on Worthington, contrary to our agreement, whilst I have done everything that we agreed.

We agreed that I would not continue the action against you providing you stopped attacking Worthington and did not use words like "fraud". As you are aware, that is the only reason why the case against you was discontinued. You told me that I should trust your word on that (" I give you my word on that and my word matters"). As you're aware the judge said you would have had an uphill struggle demonstrating that it was in the public interest to publish stolen emails.

You also assured me that the articles that you had placed would be like Internet "chip paper" yet you have republished them more prominently than expected and also after three months rather than 7 to 9 months (and you had said there would be no key words etc).

I have assumed that you were under pressure from the "rabble" as you called them to say something negative and so have tried to be sympathetic to your position. However, it appears that you are taking pot-shots that you don't appear to need to at the moment which I don't understand.

In your latest article on Worthington which, contrary to our agreement uses the word fraud, you question whether Worthington in fact sold its factory for £475,000 in an accusatory way. In fact, it was sold for £625,000, but this good news has not been trumpeted by Worthington. So the facts of this case are contrary to your allegation in the article. Whether or not there appears to be a charge against the property (I haven't bothered to check) is of no interest to Worthington as it doesn't own it any more.

Your article about championing pension rights, previously, was similarly wrong. Worthington's pension fund is independently managed by a Government appointed trustee. The Rangers money was also received in full as Worthington had repeatedly said it would be.

These are merely two examples of your inaccurate comment which I had understood neither of us wanted to spend time and money arguing about in court.

You have highlighted an interesting question in your writing by the way, namely that of the treatment of people with "controversial" histories. Firstly, it is inherently unfair to use past failings to allege current wrongdoing. Having said that, in many cases - probably most sadly - those who have committed past wrongs are quite likely to be less than perfect on the next occasion. You are dealing with the important question of character flaws and whether the concept of redemption or rehabilitation is actually possible. As it happens, in reality, most people in all walks of life are very much less than perfect, but the easier targets are those with a "history". Thus any accusation of wrongdoing, however false, is immediately given credibility because of such history. But as I've said, because many/most people don't change, on most occasions you're probably going to be right.

For my part, once I've achieved the objectives I described to you, I want to campaign to highlight what I believe is a fundamental hypocrisy in the justice system (amongst many other things I want to address in my life after business). So whilst you prefer the role of prosecutor, I prefer the role of defending Counsel. Let me explain:

As you're aware, the political and media class believe that the justice system is all about rehabilitation rather than deterrence (which I think you and I both agree is

instead the more viable system). However, in practice, this much trumpeted idea of rehabilitation is mere pretence. For example, when someone receives a state sanctioned punishment, whatever that is, that punishment should be the full price paid if the concept of rehabilitation is ever to work. That is where the idea of spent convictions comes from.

Take my case, for example. I took responsibility for and pleaded guilty to something that actually wasn't my failing 25 years ago (read my witness statement – and nowadays who takes responsibility for anything?). The judge confirmed that the case before him was not one concerning dishonesty but sentenced me to 8 weeks in prison (possibly because I couldn't pay a fine and possibly because it would be a short sharp shock and allow me to move on with my life – certainly the thoughts of my barrister at the time). What the judge didn't say in his sentence is that "in addition to the eight weeks that you must serve in prison, you will never be able to be a public company director in your entire life, the stigma will forever hangover you, people (even when the conviction is spent) will for ever be able to refer to it and also put their own inaccurate spin on it, it will also be used to suggest dishonesty in relation to anything you do, even though the case before me was specifically not one concerning dishonesty". Had he pronounced such a judgement then right thinking people would think he was being rather harsh to say the least – particularly as such a punishment was obviously not on the statute books. But in reality, it would have been better for me if he had pronounced such a clear sentence, because I would have known exactly where I stood – rather than believing that once the price has been paid in full that is supposed to be it. My life would not have been anywhere near as difficult had he pronounced such a harsh sentence – I would have done something entirely different with my life. The icing on the cake, of course, was the idea that in my injunction proceedings against you, the 25 year old spent conviction – which should not even be referred to at all if the concept of "spent" has any meaning at all – should have been referred to in my injunction application. Not only did that not cross my mind, but neither did my barrister ask me whether I had once had a parking fine 25 years ago or been convicted of anything else not involving dishonesty.



Undoubtedly, therefore, the law should be changed, either to make it an offence to refer to convictions claimed to be spent by the political class or to make the sentences handed down by judges Real; so the electorate can see whether a sentence in reality is fair or not.

You are fortunate that the system suggests that a 25-year-old spent conviction should have been mentioned. That is why the injunction was set aside. At some point, as I say, I want to highlight the fundamental injustice or hypocrisy of that in a judicial system that claims it cares deeply about rehabilitation. In reality, as I've shown, that is simply untrue.

Anyway, I've had my little rant, I hope that we can be the friends I thought we were becoming and that the latest posts are merely placating the "rabble". From my end, we are hopeful that we will complete our significant transactions before the expiry of the latest extension. I have to say, though, that your posts don't make it any easier! I hope you hope that the deals we are working on will bring substantial value to shareholders, to hope for anything else would be to hope for evil – not a good place to be.

If you fancy a beer again sometime I have a lot of fascinating stuff to tell you – but you're buying this time!

Best regards

Aidan

---

From: aidan.ce@outlook.com  
To: tomat49@gmail.com  
Subject: RE: my little joke - you are outed!  
Date: Wed, 1 Apr 2015 09:54:25 +0100

Thanks Tom, very funny! That will definitely get them guessing!

I thought your cast on WRN was class yesterday - you outlined plan c if plan b doesn't work!!

A.

---

Date: Wed, 1 Apr 2015 09:07:41 +0100  
Subject: my little joke - you are outed!  
From: tomat49@gmail.com  
To: aidan.ce@outlook.com; martha.gall@gmail.com; editorial@shareprophets.com

<http://www.shareprophets.com/views/11398/breaking-aiden-earley-of-worthington-to-speak-at-uk-investor-on-faith-money>

They will think it is an april fool. we know it is not! This way we maximise the impact of this.

Next up is your rangers status - will save that for the w/e - there is an easter read thru if you know what i mean

Martha and darren will be in touch on timings and logistics.

if you want to run your talk by someone ahead of the day I am in london 14th onwards

t

Print

Close

---

From: **Tom Winnifrith** (tomat49@gmail.com)

Sent: 06 August 2015 13:23:30

To: aidan CE (aidan.ce@outlook.com)

You dont half send long emails.....

i have tweaked all the articles so they are toned down.

will do that beer but not for a while. Too many family matters pressing so really am off work 100% as of today, just wrapping up now

t