

CONFIRMATION
OF FAX



10 January 1996

Telecommunications
Industry
Ombudsman

Mr Alan Smith
Cape Bridgewater Holiday Camp
Blowholes Rd
RMB 4408
CAPE BRIDGEWATER VIC 3306

John Pinnock
Ombudsman


Dear Mr Smith

I refer to your letter of 31 December 1996 in which you seek to access to various correspondence held by the TIO concerning the Fast Track Arbitration Procedure.

The arbitration of your claim was completed when an award was made in your favour more than eighteen months ago and my role as Administrator is over.

I do not propose to provide you with copies of any documents held by this office.

Yours sincerely


JOHN PINNOCK
OMBUDSMAN

8 A

"... providing independent, just, informal, speedy resolution of complaints."

TIO LTD ACN 057 634 787
National Headquarters
315 Exhibition Street
Melbourne Victoria

Box 18098
Collins Street East
Melbourne 3000

Telephone (03) 9277 8777
Facsimile (03) 9277 8797
Tel. Freecall 1800 062 058
Fax Freecall 1800 630 614

23 January 1996

Our Ref: GLH
Matter No:

Mr J Pinnock
Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman
321 Exhibition Street
MELBOURNE Vic 3000

Dear Mr Pinnock

INSTITUTE OF ARBITRATORS - COMPLAINT BY ALAN SMITH

I enclose copy letters dated 18 and 19 January 1996 from the Institute of Arbitrators Australia. I would like to discuss a number of matters which arise from these letters, including:

- (a) the cost of responding to the allegations;
- (b) the implications to the arbitration procedure if I make a full and frank disclosure of the facts to Mr James.

Yours sincerely


GORDON HUGHES

Encl.
cc P Bartlett

Partner
Peter J. Smith
Peter D. Francis
James M. Lightowler
Wayne B. Cahill
Neville G.H. Debn
Grant D. Selton
Charles Vennart
William P. O'Shea
David G. Whitt

Consultants
Kenneth M. Martin
Richard J. Kellaway
Andrew Jenkins

Associates
Sharon G. Hird
John S. Mair
Melissa A. Hencke
Francis V. Gallich
John D.F. Morris
Michael S. Cassici

Incorporating
Francis Abromick

Melb

Sydney

Sydney

Brisba

Canber

Newca

represented in

Adela

Darwi

8B

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly at KPMG should you wish to discuss any matters associated with these arbitration's. My direct line is 9288 5457.

Yours faithfully

John W Rundell

cc

Ms Susan Hodgkinson
Project Manager
Resource Unit
Ferrier Hodgson Corporate Advisory

claimants and also I knew Mr Ryan professionally from his time as a partner of Touche Ross.

2. Further, on Thursday, 18 May (not 17 May 1995, as dated by Mr Ryan) I received two pager messages from Mr Ryan. I then returned his call early afternoon by mobile phone. I do not have a file note record of this call as I was in a car at Tyab on the Mornington Peninsula. I do not believe that I made the statement he has attributed to me. From my recollection of the call, Mr Ryan was attempting to make me commit to statements, which I was unwilling to comment on. Unfortunately, I can provide no further details of this call.

Other Matters

Further, I wish to advise that I am most concerned by the fact that Mr Smith engaged a private investigator, who visited me at my home on 27 December 1995, with the intention of discussing matters associated with the Ferrier Hodgson report. I found such an intrusion into my privacy and home (and also the tape recording of our discussion without advice) highly unusual and inappropriate.

As you may be aware, I have contacted the Brighton CIB in relation to:

1. damage to property at my home
2. the actions of Mr Smith impersonating me and pursuing me via the use of a private investigator.

You should be aware that the Brighton CIB intend to interview Mr Smith in relation to criminal damage to my property, but regard the matter of his impersonation and tape recording and telephoning me at home as civil matters.

Could you please provide a copy of relevant correspondence sent to Mr Smith advising him not to make contact with members of the resource unit to assist the police in their investigations.

You should also be aware that as a result of the actions by Mr Smith in contacting me at home. I have reluctantly found it necessary to install a private and silent telephone line at home. Although, Telstra offered to provide this without charge, I would not accept that and will be paying the cost on my account.

May I take this opportunity of wishing you and your staff all the best for 1996, and I trust that you will shortly receive resolution of these outstanding fast track arbitration's.

John W Rundell
95 Dendy Street
BRIGHTON VIC 3186

Private & Confidential

Mr John Pinnock
Ombudsman
Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman
315 Exhibition Street
Melbourne VIC 3000

COPY

13 February 1996

Dear John

Fast Track Arbitration Procedure - Alan Smith

Other matters: D M Ryan letter of 22 December 1995

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 23 January 1996, enclosing a copy of a letter dated 22 December 1995, which you received from Mr Derek Ryan. I have reviewed his letter and refute that the statement that FHCA had excluded a large amount of information from their final report "at the request of the arbitrator".

I did advise Mr Ryan that the final report did not cover all material and working papers.

The Ferrier Hodgson report was prepared for the arbitrator and was provided as part of the Fast Track Arbitration to Mr Ryan and Mr Smith for comment and they did so in writing to the arbitrator.

I am surprised that it is only now some 8 months since my telephone calls with Mr Ryan that this matter has been raised with you.

Contact with Mr Derek Ryan

For your information, I now outline the details of my limited discussions with Mr Ryan.

1. On 8 May 1995, I received a telephone call from Mr Ryan and at the time Ms Susan Hodgkinson was in my office. The discussion was cautious and I was unwilling to meet with Mr Ryan at that time. I suggested that I would be happy to meet with him after the appeal period for the Smith arbitration had passed, but only to discuss the information required and preferred approach in relation to other claims. I felt this may be useful as Mr Ryan had advised me that he acted for a number of other COT

80



Hunt & Hunt LAWYERS

Partners
 David M. Scarlett
 Edward S. Boyce
 James G.F. Harrowell
 Gordon L. Hughes
 Mark T. Knapman
 David P. Cooper
 Ian S. Craig
 Peter J. Ewin
 Peter D. Francis
 Jenni M. Lightowlers
 Wayne B. Cahill
 Neville G.H. Debney
 Grant D. Sefton
 Charles Veevers
 William P. O'Shea
 David G. Watts

Consultants
 Kenneth M. Martin
 Richard I. Kallaway
 Andrew Jenkins

Associates
 Shane C. Hird
 John S. Molnar
 Melissa A. Henderson
 Francis V. Galichio
 John D.F. Morris
 Michael S. Carrick

Incorporating:
 Francis Abourizk Ligi

15 February 1996

Our Ref: GLH
Matter No: 5122795

Mr John Pinnock
Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman
321 Exhibition Street
MELBOURNE Vic 3000

Dear Mr Pinnock

ALAN SMITH

I enclose a draft letter which I propose forwarding to the Institute of Arbitrators Australia in response to the complaint by Mr Smith.

I would appreciate your confirmation that there is nothing in the proposed letter which would embarrass your office or jeopardise the current arbitrations.

|| You may consider it appropriate for you to provide an independent letter of support. This is of course a matter for your discretion.

I await your response.

Yours sincerely


GORDON HUGHES


Encl.

*See covered with Lia
To speak to Gordon re 3 matters X
letter in support to be prepared.
GLH*

melbourn
sydney
sydney w
brisbane
canberra
newcastl
represented in
adelaide
darwin

8D

Hunt & Hunt
LAWYERS




Our Ref: 5122795
Matter No: 5122795

- Partners**
David M. Scarlett
Edward S. Boyce
James C.F. Morrow
Gordon L. Hughes
Mark T. Knaoman
David P. Cooper
Ian S. Craig
Peter J. Ewin
Peter D. Francis
Jenni M. Lightowler
Wayne B. Cahill
Neville C.M. Debnie
Grant D. Selton
Charles Veivers
William P. O'Shea
David C. Wallis
- Consultants**
Kenneth M. Martin
Richard I. Kellaway
Andrew Jenkins
- Associates**
Shane C. Mird
John S. Vignar
Melissa A. Henderson
Francis V. Gallohas
John D.F. Morris
Michael S. Carrick
- Incorporating**
Francis Abourizk Uj

16 February 1996

Mr L E James
President
Institute of Arbitrators Australia
Level 1, 22 William Street
MELBOURNE Vic 3000



Dear Mr James

COMPLAINT - ALAN SMITH

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 18 January 1996.

It is difficult for me to comment on a number of the matters raised by Mr Smith because of the confidentiality which surrounds not only his own claim but also numerous related claims which are still current.

Smith's Letter of 15 January 1996

There is no evidence of which I am aware to suggest that the arbitration rules were not followed or that either party was denied natural justice.

Mr Smith's recollection and interpretation of events surrounding the commencement of the arbitration in April 1994 are incorrect. He makes reference to the involvement of Peter Bartlett of Messrs Minter Ellison. I am enclosing a letter from Mr Bartlett to the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman (the administrator of the arbitration procedure) dated 17 January 1996 which is self explanatory. I do not believe it is necessary for me to add more.

Mr Smith's assertion that the technical report of an expert witness has not been signed is incorrect. A copy of the signed cover letter to the document, dated 30 April 1995, is attached.

The assertion that another expert witness attached to the Resource Unit, John Rundell, deleted material from his report at my request is incorrect and misconceived. The allegation was first raised in a letter from Mr Smith's accountant, Derek Ryan, to the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman, dated 22 December 1995. In this regard, I enclose copy of a letter from Mr Rundell (now of KPMG) to the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman dated 13 February 1996 which addresses the allegation. Again I do not believe it is necessary for me to add more.

- melbourn
- sydney
- sydney n
- brisbane
- canberra
- newcastle
- perth
- adelaide
- darwin

8E

The Australian members of the firm are admitted to the practice of law in Australia. The American members are admitted to the practice of law in the United States.

↓

●● Document - "One Example of Incorrect Statements"

→ Mr Smith forwarded you a document headed "One Example of Incorrect Statements Made by the Technical Unit Attached to the FTAP". I am not convinced that this document contains any allegations to which I need respond. I note, nevertheless, some suggestion that evidence was ignored at an oral hearing. If, in paragraph (b), Mr Smith is referring to the oral hearing which took place on 11 October 1994, the transcript reveals no reference to "four exercise books" as he claims. Reference is made to "diaries" which contained evidence of complaints and these were in fact placed into evidence.

D M Ryan Letters

I have noted the two letters from D M Ryan Corporate dated 6 December and 22 December 1995. I have already commented on one of the letters above. Apart from being inaccurate, they reveal a misunderstanding by Mr Ryan of the arbitration agreement. He does not appreciate the unique role given to the "Resource Unit" comprising Ferrier Hodgson Corporate Advisory and DMR Group Inc (Canada). Perhaps Mr Ryan was not adequately briefed by Mr Smith in this regard.

Letter to Senator Evans

Mr Smith provided you with a copy of a letter to Senator Gareth Evans dated 4 January 1996. I presume you require me to comment on those aspects of the letter which reflect upon my conduct as an arbitrator.

The letter to Senator Evans is littered with inaccuracies. Some examples are:

- contrary to Mr Smith's assertion on page 3, his 24,000 (sic) documents were all viewed by me, Ferrier Hodgson Corporate Advisory, DMR Group Inc. (Canada) and Lane Telecommunications Pty Ltd in accordance with the arbitration procedure. Mr Smith was provided with a list of documents in a technical report from the Resource Unit dated 30 April 1995. This list summarised the major documents culled from the 24,000 documents and upon which the findings of the technical experts were based;
- Mr Smith's assertion on page 4 that a technical expert, Mr Read, refused to discuss technical information at his premises on 6 April 1995 is correct - in this regard, Mr Read was acting in accordance with his interpretation of my direction which prohibited him from speaking to one party in the absence of the other party at any site visit;
- if, on page 5, Mr Smith is disputing that I worked in conjunction with the Resource Unit throughout the weekend of 29 to 30 April 1995, he is incorrect;

the remainder of the letter deals with matters which have either been addressed above or which are generalisations of little or no relevance to my conduct as an arbitrator.

Smith's Letter of 18 January 1996

I have noted Mr Smith's letter to you dated 18 January 1996. This does not raise any matter which is not dealt with above.

Comment

I sympathise in many respects with Mr Smith. This level of sympathy was reflected in my award and the reasons which accompanied the award. In essence, Mr Smith suffered financially and emotionally as a result of investing in a business which was in some respects, and to some extent, poorly serviced by Telstra.

Mr Smith was previously awarded a sum of money by Telstra in an out-of-court settlement. Telstra agreed to reopen his claim and submit his grievances to a dispute resolution process which ultimately took the form of an arbitration. I was asked by the Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman if I would act as arbitrator, and both parties subsequently acquiesced. As a result of the arbitration, Mr Smith was awarded further compensation.

I awarded Mr Smith a sum substantially less than the amount he was claiming and substantially less than the amount which Derek Ryan apparently led him to believe he would recover. It was, nevertheless, a sum in excess of the damages recommended by Ferrier Hodgson Corporate Advisory in its capacity as an independent financial expert witness.

It seems Mr Smith can only rationalise the result of the arbitration by retrospectively finding fault with the agreed procedure, by alleging a "conspiracy" between me and Telstra and by asserting that I have overlooked relevant information contained in the 24,000 documents to which he refers. Put simply, he is wrong.

I consent to you disclosing this letter to Mr Smith, save that I do not consent to the disclosure of the attached correspondence from third parties.

Yours sincerely



GORDON HUGHES

Encl.

cc J Pinnock (Telecommunications Industry Ombudsman)