

two versions of the plan, and this is important "The industrial land component ... (reads) ... the clipped version".

He says that he recognised the clipped version as being the same as those admitted into evidence by Wilson of the council in the original 1987 Magistrates' Court proceeding, and that the plans, he says, "have been clipped in copying ... (reads) ... Supreme Court appeal". He went on then to say in his affidavit that because he reviewed the documents in the black folder and reflected on the evidence in the previous proceedings, that he's now able to reach conclusions that form the basis of the allegations in the omitted paragraphs.

It all comes down to the critical document from the black folder which led him to reach the conclusions which underpin the allegations in the omitted paragraphs. It's important that no documents from the black folder are exhibited other than the one critical document which is the complete version of plans for the industrial allotment and which he really deposes to be the critical piece in the puzzle that enables him to fully comprehend events that he asserts took place 25 years ago in 1980.

His case is, in 2000 I first saw the document. Now, that was his case and before lunch I mentioned the problem and I just want to go back to reiterate this because this isn't a matter that's the subject of contested evidence. Can I take you back again to Mr Thompson's second affidavit sworn on 7 November .VTS:DT 14/11/05

Thompson