Dear Commander Cundy,

We thank you for your letter of 27 November and we are grateful to you for taking the trouble to consider the nature of our complaint with care and for seeking independent legal advice.

It is of course entirely right that the advice is subject to legal professional privilege. However, the safeguard of confidentiality may always be waived of course by the lay client - in this case the Metropolitan Police.

May we invite you therefore to disclose the nature of the reasoning behind the advice? We do so at the suggestion of David Wolchover, to whom we have shown your letter. His position is that while at present he firmly adheres to the view expressed in his writings on this issue he always maintains an open mind about matters on which he contributes commentary. If on assimilating the reasoning behind the advice you have received he considers it is sound and that it causes him to accept that he has been labouring under a misapprehension he would make no bones about coming out and confessing that he has changed his mind, however much it may disappoint his legion of readers. The problem is that the government, through their legal service, have not hitherto come forth publicly with any coherent response to the essential invalidity argument.

David says that he would be very happy to meet with the practitioner whom you instructed, in order to discuss the nuts and bolts in a spirit of academic inquiry. It is entirely conceivable that they already know each other.

Yours sincerely

[Signature], on behalf of the Wolchover Action Group