

John Cleary

From: Paul Rosser [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, 31 August 2010 10:18 AM
To: John Cleary; sebsue
Subject: PSC review

Dear John & Stephen

It seems that the Parkinson review is to proceed without DC having agreed on terms of reference

Our concern as the sub-committee of DC has been with matters of process. If you both agree I would suggest that the Bishop be requested to place before Prof Parkinson the following questions with respect to the recently completed Gumbley and COJ matters:

1. Were the suspension recommendation processes used appropriately in each case?
2. In particular, were the respondent's given an opportunity to be heard prior to the recommendations as required by section 35?
3. Was there in either case a relevant 'risk' in terms of section 37?
4. Was there appropriate consultation with the relevant church body in either case as required by section 37(d)?
5. Why directions given to the respondents by or for the PSC given in accordance with the Ordinance?
6. In the Gumbley case was the apparently unlawfully obtained material used appropriately?
7. After the first installment of such material was received should steps have been taken to prevent receipt of a second installment?
8. In the COJ case, by what authority was the public meeting at [REDACTED] held? Did this constitute a breach of confidentiality?
9. Was an offer to pay COJ's legal costs made? If so by what authority? Was this appropriate in the circumstances?

These questions appear to me to focus the areas of concern.

Stephen, would you please indicate to John your concurrence or otherwise.

Paul Rosser

--

If you receive this e-mail by mistake please contact me immediately. The information contained in this e-mail and any attachment should be treated as confidential and should not be further dealt with without my express consent. I do not waive any right of privilege, confidentiality or copyright associated with this email or any attachment either on my own behalf or on behalf of any other person. I do not warrant that this email or any attachment is free of any virus or defect and consequently do not accept liability for any loss or damage should the e-mail or any attachment be defective in any way.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under the Professional Standards Legislation