



Office of the Archbishop

St. Patrick's Cathedral.
Melbourne. Vic., 3002
Telephone: 667 0377

6 April, 1994

Mr A.W.LeP. Darvall,
Partner,
Corrs Chambers Westgarth,
G.P.O. Box 9925,
MELBOURNE. Vic. 3001.

AND BY FACSIMILE No.602 5544

Dear Mr Darvall,

REVEREND R. PICKERING

The Easter break plays havoc with proper speedy handling of issues, and the enclosed copy of a letter of 25th March, 1994, from Dunhill Madden Butler is just another proof.

The letter disturbs us for two reasons in particular. In the first instance, the second paragraph which advises that C.C.I. "have instructed us to act on behalf of the Archbishop". This was, of course, news to the Archbishop. Does C.C.I. cover automatically imply that it is thereby acting for the Archbishop and will use its own Solicitors to act for him? Of course, we have no doubt that Dunhill Madden Butler is acting very competently indeed.

Secondly, the Archbishop is uneasy about allowing access to the complete file on Fr Pickering, but if the Solicitors acting for him require it, I suppose he has to go along with the request. In any event, our position has been that the claim by ^{BTU} is against Fr Pickering and has no relevance for the Archbishop unless there is clear evidence that the Archbishop or the Archdiocese were implicated in the alleged offence.

Your advice to a puzzled client would be appreciated. Incidentally, I think they have written to me because I was the one who wrote to you about this claim during and immediately after the Christmas break.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Reverend B.J.Fleming
PERSONAL ASSISTANT

Enc.

COPY