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            Thursday, 12 October 2023
(10.30 a.m.)
    DISCUSSION re Written Submissions
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Thank you very much. Just
before I start, can I just check what the screen is
doing? Is it with a transcriber?
    MS TOUBE: All of these things, I believe, are
set up for a trial that is going to start this
afternoon.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: I see. All right.
    MS TOUBE: So I suspect that is what it is.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Can I just say
that I have had a variety of submissions this
morning. I am not sure whether they have been
circulated to everyone on the counsel team. I have
had emails early this morning from Mr Pyatt, I have
had a written submission from Mr Bishop, and I have
had another submission from Mr Agathangelou. Have
those been sent to everybody?
    MS TOUBE: I certainly have not seen them, my
Lady.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: No? All right. They go to
the process issues. I think it is fair to say that
they express general concern at the process points,
```
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and I am sure that they essentially reiterate points
that have been made earlier and I know also have
been made over the course of the past couple of
days. Could you perhaps ask those behind you to
contact my clerk and arrange for those submissions
to be sent on to you? So, for the avoidance of
doubt, I will read out the timings of the emails.
Email from Mr Pyatt sent this morning at 6.42 . Then
somewhat later, I am afraid I have not got the time
printed out here, a written submission in a Word
document sent by Mr Mark Bishop, and then at 8.56,
an email from Mr Agathangelou. Now, can I check
whether Mr Bishop and Mr Agathangelou are here
today?
MR BOMPAS: Yes, indeed, they are here.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Both of them? All right.
So they are both in court. I think perhaps it would
also be helpful if you would-- Do you have the
email addresses of a contact at Clifford Chance?
MR BOMPAS: I am sorry, I could not quite hear
the question, my Lady.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Do you have the email
addresses for the solicitors at Clifford Chance?
MR BOMPAS: I am not sure I have.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Well, they are
in court so you could just go and speak to them and ask for those to be sent to you. I think it is fair to say that the matters that are set out in those emails are matters that we will be coming onto in any event. What I will say now is that Mr Bishop alone among those asked if he could make further submissions at the hearing today before I delivered judgment. Initially, I refused that request on the basis that the issues of class composition had been addressed at the hearing which concluded on Tuesday and that I was not minded to hear further submissions on those issues. Mr Bishop then replied saying that he wanted to make submissions on a new point and new information that had only just come to light. Rather than inviting him to make submissions for the first time at the start of the hearing today, I asked if he would set out by email what his submissions were, and I am sorry that was not copied to you, apparently, but hopefully that everyone's solicitors will now get that.

Having looked at those submissions, I am satisfied that the points that Mr Bishop wanted to make go to the process points, and although he says at the end of his written submission that he thinks that that goes to class composition, I do not agree
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with that submission, and I am just going to read out, for everyone in the court, the point that he makes regarding class composition:
"We ask that the court gives consideration to requiring two votes, one for private investors, the other for institutional, with a 75 per cent by value of those participating threshold for each, and especially in relation to the former, given concerns about shortcomings and challenges in communications, also a meaningful threshold in terms of the proportion of all investors in that class who actually cast their votes."
If I understand rightly, what he is saying is that given his concerns about challenges and shortcomings and communications, he considers that the court should order two votes. I will address that at the end of my judgment, but I am just going to say now that that is not an issue that goes to class composition; it is an issue that goes to whether I am satisfied with the material that is being given to the investors as part of the package ahead of the court meeting and the sanction hearing

So I am not going to invite or indeed permit

```
any further submissions to be made now. I am going
to give judgment for the----
    MS TOUBE: My Lady, I am so sorry, but I am
told that the live stream is not working.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Ah. All right.
    MR SMITH(?): Judge, I think it is actually the
sound is-- (inaudible)----
    COUNSEL: There is no sound.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Is it that
those on the live stream cannot hear me?
    MR BOMPAS: It is unmuted now.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: And I am not sure which of
these microphones is the right one.
    It is this one? All right. All right.
    MS TOUBE: Yes. I think it is----
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Is that better for those on
the live stream?
    MS TOUBE: Can we work out the answer to that?
Is it better now? I do not know. Where did we find
out it was not working?
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Can someone on the live
stream perhaps indicate whether they can now hear
the proceedings in court?
    MR BOMPAS: I am told, not.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Is any sound audible, or is
        5
    it just faint?
    COUNSEL: I think it was just faint.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, the microphone is as
close as it can be, really, to my mouth without me
actually eating it. I am not sure that I can do
much better than that, if this is, as I understand
it, the correct microphone? Can they hear any
better now?
    MS TOUBE: No.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Is there another microphone
that can be used? Is this one also for the live
stream?
    COUNSEL: They can hear it, but it is very
quiet.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, all right, let me see
if that can be brought closer. Is that any better
for those on the live stream?
    COUNSEL: We are checking. (After a pause) No.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: No? All right, what I am
going to do, I am just wondering if there is any
other court available. I know it is going to
involve everyone moving, or if a technician can be
brought in?
    COUNSEL: If needs be we can find a technician.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, can you sort that out?
```

numbers of people who have dialled in, I do not wan
to go ahead if there is anything that we can do to
enable the audio on the live stream to work. All
right, thank you, but we only do have until one
o'clock because, as I understand it, there is
another hearing here this afternoon and I have got
other commitments this afternoon. All right.
(10.38 a.m.)
(Short break)
(10.47 a.m.)

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Are those who are on the
live feed now able to hear the court proceedings?
COUNSEL: Yes, they can.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Good. All right.
(See separate transcript for judgment)
DISCUSSION re Consequential Issues
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Are there any consequential issues that immediately follow from that?

MR BOMPAS: My Lady, I just wanted to mention something that arose out of your Ladyship's judgment. You identified the number of Harcus Parker and Leigh Day clients. In fact, there are more than that that are their clients and have the same claims. There have been a limit on what the
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claims have been issued.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right----
    MR BOMPAS: So, it is a small point.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: -- so, what I am proposing
to do, when I get the transcript of my judgment, I
am, of course, not going to simply approve that and
send it back to the transcribers. What I will do is
to send it to counsel for comments and corrections.
My judgment is my judgment as it stands today, but
that will be an opportunity for you----
    MR BOMPAS: To correct that sort of small
point.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: -- particularly to correct
small points like that. I am aware that this
judgement has been delivered essentially extempore,
at very short notice, so no doubt there will be
points of detail that you will both want to comment
on.
    MR BOMPAS: We are all grateful for the time
your Ladyship's put into that.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
    MR BOMPAS: But there is, again, another point
which I think may come up this morning. My learned
friend has a view about it. That is the question of
the identification, the identity, between Scheme
```

Creditors and current investors. I think that your Ladyship made the remark that Scheme Creditors receive in proportion to their investments in the fund. As I am going to explain when one comes to a point on the documents - I mean it may not even be a detail we need to go into for the purposes of the next stages on - there is actually a disparity. You may be a Scheme Creditor without holding any present investment and as such you may not receive anything out of the Fund as a result of this compromise, and that is the mismatch I did explain briefly in my oral address to your Ladyship.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Right. All right. Well, if that goes to anything which is in my judgment, you will no doubt (inaudible)----

MR BOMPAS: I do not believe it is, although it may be relevant when one comes to actually how the Scheme is formulated.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, all right.
MR BOMPAS: Which is going to be-- it is really a matter for the company now, I think.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, all right. So, that is the class composition issue. Now, as I said in my judgment, there are two other main issues, I think, and correct me if I am wrong. The first is
the process issues, how we deal with this going forward. That includes the process of notification and the information, the content of the information which is given to the interested parties in the form of the explanatory statement and other materials. Now, those issues, I know, have greatly troubled many of the investors, and I want them to understand that I have read those submissions. I have read your emails this morning. I have considered carefully the submissions made to me in writing, and of course the concerns that were expressed orally at the hearing on 10 August.

I did briefly skim down the table in the most recent document that was sent to me. I am afraid it only got to me a short time before the hearing. I cannot claim in that time to have read in any detail the 385 pages of that document. What I did do is to very quickly go to a table that is located somewhere near the end, starting at p .321 with the Scheme Creditor feedback. Now, my understanding from that table is that following the hearing a message was sent to investors asking for their comments on the draft scheme documents and in particular the Explanatory Statement. I have read very quickly the comments that have been summarised in that table and

## the Clifford Chance response. <br> Now, some of the comments are, I think it is fair to say, issues that really go to the sanctions-- well, not to the sanctions-- partly to the sanctions stage and partly to simply comments on the way that those investors are going to vote at the court meeting. That is not for me now, but there were a number of comments about the short period of time which those contacted had had to comment on the documents. I just wanted to record, and I am not making any determination on that, but I just wanted those who are on the live stream and those who are here in court to know that I have read that table because that seemed to me to contain additional information about the concerns of the investors. So, I do want you to know that I have read those, and I will be hoping for responses from Ms Toube and others this morning as to what is to be done about those concerns. <br> As a final point, I think that one, maybe more, of the comments complained that there had only been a brief opportunity at the end of Tuesday's hearing for Mr Pyatt and Mr Dickenson to comment and that they went last. The reason for putting them last was that it was apparent from the outset that the
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main issue was going to be class composition, which was the subject of legal submissions, and I had extensive legal submissions from both sides at the hearing. Most of the issues raised by Mr Pyatt and Mr Dickenson, and indeed all of the individual investors who have made comments, go to the question of process and the voting form, and although it is important to hear their submissions, and we did hear those submissions, those were obviously the subject of further discussion between the parties. So, it was not a good use of court time and in a hearing that had already gone on for beyond the end of the court day to hear extensive further submissions on matters that were still subject to discussion, but I do know that there have been further comments from both of those individuals since to which Clifford Chance have made responses, and I have briefly looked at Clifford Chance's responses.

I should also say that I have also skimmed through the Explanatory Statement and the red line to that to see the changes that have being made. Again, since this document was provided to me about half an hour before the hearing, you will not be surprised to hear that I have not gone through it with a fine-tooth comb. Can I just say, I
identified one typographical error. On p. 173 of the bundle, there was a red line which said "third parry" rather than "third party," but I have not-although you might think from that, so I have gone through it with a fine-tooth comb, that just leapt off the page. I would like Ms Toube and Mr Bompas and others as appropriate, including the investors, to make submissions as appropriate as to the process going forward, and in particular, I would like Ms Toube to respond to the concerns about timing for further comments and notifications. So, Ms-- I think really you should start off by making submissions on the process points now.

SUBMISSIONS by Ms TOUBE
MS TOUBE: Yes. If you will just allow me, before I do that, there is one point that I will forget if $I$ do not do it first, which is there is a correction which has been asked to be made to one paragraph of the witness statement, and that appears----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Is this Mr Midl's witness statement?

MS TOUBE: It is Mr Midl's witness statement.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Oh, I have got the original hearing bundle up. Which page?

MS TOUBE: It is-- I am sorry, just give me a moment. It is at p. 78 of the original hearing bundle. It is para. 180 .

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MS TOUBE: And this is a point that was referred to in the letter that appears at p. 362 of this new bundle. So, it is the Linklater's letter.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MS TOUBE: And effectively the point is this, it is the question about what was or was not originally halted under the Standstill Agreement, and at the moment, para. 180 says that the claims are currently halted under the Standstill Agreement. It should not say that. It should say -- and we would propose to amend it to say, "HLAM in the event that it establishes contribution claims against FSL," and delete the rest of that.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MS TOUBE: None of this is material, but they specifically asked us to correct it.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, and it is proper. This was a document before the court. Although it is not material, I think to the discussion that we are now about to have, it is absolutely right that you draw that to my attention. Thank you very much.

MS TOUBE: So that is point number one. Number
two: I was just going to tell your Ladyship what we have done since the last hearing, and I think you will have-- I say you will have picked it up, you will have picked it up by the fact that there is that table that, as your Ladyship suggested, we did go out. We sent the documents in the bundle to Mr Dickenson and Mr Pyatt. We sent the-- put the draft Scheme documents up on the website. We sent them to the platform and directly to the direct holders who we know about. We sent all the documents again to Leigh Day, Harcus Parker, the Investment Committee, the Independent Advisor, the FSCS, the Parent, the FCA, and Hargreaves Lansdown.

Hargreaves Lansdown told us that they had sent them on to the investors. We received comments from Leigh Day, Harcus Parker, Mr Pyatt, Mr Dickenson, Quilter, Hargreaves Lansdown, the Investor Advocate, and we had a conference call with my learned friends. We then had, as you will have seen, a number of disparate communications with other investors.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. Can I just say that I would like to record my gratitude to everyone for the hard work that has gone on since that hearing.
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[^0]normal scheme process. So, normally, the Explan does not go out to anybody at all until after the convening hearing. The court of course only has to approve it at a high level, and so we are certainly not asking the court to go through and draft on any of these issues.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No. I mean, of course. I think this may be a matter of some confusion. Of course, if there are problems with the information that has been given in the explanatory memorandum and any of the other documents, those can quite properly be brought to the attention of the court at the sanction hearing.

MS TOUBE: Yes. Although -- and your Ladyship will remember we had this discussion that although my learned friends have obviously raised a number of points already, they wanted to reserve their rights, and I said, "Well, the practice statement makes it clear that if there are issues with the Explanatory Statement, then the court can deal with that issue at sanction." So, there is no-- although the investors have not had an opportunity to draft the documents - and I should say such comments as we have had that have been helpful, we have taken into account already - that is not shutting them out 17

[^1]way that is not the way that they normally deal with their investments. But we obviously want to get the information out there and people to know what it is, and to be able to consider it, and to vote.

I did have an opportunity to have a brief discussion with Mr Smith and the FCA this morning about a suggestion that was made by one of the Scheme supervisors, which was that it might assist if the FCA could directly contact the platforms and say, "Please put this down to your investors. So, push it down to your investors." There are quite a lot of them. I understand there are about 90 platforms, so I am not going to-- I do not think I am in a position to commit the FCA to doing this, but they have said they will do what they can to help.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. What about the suggestion - I think it was Mr-- you probably have not had this because this is one of the emails that has just come to me. I had a suggestion. I saw a suggestion somewhere that in sending the communications to investors -- yes. Sorry. This was Mr Pyatt:
"The company should be instructed by the court that the platforms and
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intermediary communications to their clients must ensure any automatic notification directly refers to urgent, important WEIF Link Equity Income Funds, and if that cannot be achieved by an automated email notification system, then the platforms and intermediaries can send a direct email to the clients and not through the platform portal, with the same words in the subject, 'Urgent, important WEIF Link Equity Income Fund.'"
If I understand the point being made, it is that in some cases - well, it is often the case via these platforms, and it is the same when banks, for example, communicate with you - all the customer is told is that there is a message sitting in your online account, and in most cases it is a routine communication which does not need your urgent attention. I think the problem being identified here is that one might get a similar automatic email notification which does not tell you anything at all about the subject matter of it, which does not draw to the customer's attention, that they really do need to look at this urgently, as opposed to in six months or a year's time when they do their -- you
know, catch-up on administration, seeing that there is a letter with terms and conditions or something routine like that.

MS TOUBE: So, I think the short answer is that we do not have any problem with asking the platforms to do that, or indeed asking the FCA to also ask the platforms to do that. I am not sure we can make them do that.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, and the platforms are of course not here. So it is very difficult for me to make any order, but I could say that you should ask the platforms to do that as part of your communications with them, that either-- if the automated system enables attention to be drawn in capital letters. You will see when you get this email from Mr Pyatt what he suggested, but I do not think it is an unreasonable suggestion. Either attention should be drawn in capital letters to this, that this is an urgent and important communication regarding the WEIF Link Equity Income Fund, or if that cannot be done in the automated process, the platform should send an email to their investors with that information in it.

MS TOUBE: Yes. We absolutely have no problem with asking them to do that.
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. All right. So, you have dealt with the Explanatory Statement, the hearing, the notification process. I am obviously going to hear from others. I do not think you have yet referred me to the content issue and the concern raised by some of the individual investors and some of those recorded in the table about the extent of information they have received, in particular about the FCA Draft Warning Notice. Now, I think it is right to say that under s.391, as far as I understand, the notice itself is absolutely protected from publication. I cannot see any carve-out in that for publication by consent.

What there is, however, in sub-s.1C is this:
"After consulting the persons to whom
the notice is given or copied, the regulator giving the notice may publish such information about the matter to which
the notice relates as it considers appropriate."
So, although it appears to me-- and I will obviously hear submissions from others on this. It appears to me that the notice itself cannot be published and there is no exception to that. What could be done is that further information could be
given about the FCA's investigation and case, and that avoids the-- it may not completely deal with it because you will have literally the word for word of what is in the Draft Notice, but I think the concern is that not very much has been said.

MS TOUBE: Yes. We did have a discussion with the FCA about how much we could say, and we came down to these words because that was, as we understood it, what could be said. As I recall it from Mr Smith's submissions on the last occasion, it is not just the company but anybody else who would be----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No third parties----
MS TOUBE: - - any third parties mentioned in it. I think his indication was that it would be very difficult to say very much more, or redact it, or anything else. Now, if we can, I am happy to revisit it with the FCA and see if there is more that we and they can say, but as your Ladyship says, there is an absolute bar on this.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: On publication of the entire notice.

MS TOUBE: Absolutely right. So, it is a question for the FCA as to what the regulator considers appropriate under s.3911C.
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. Well, I mean, I am not sure that I can go further than that today, save for saying that I would invite the parties, including the FCA, to consider what more can be said. And obviously, if by the time of the court meeting and sanction hearing thereafter, if there is approval of the Scheme at the court meeting, certain investors consider that they still have not had enough information, then again, that will be a matter that can and should be brought to the court's attention at the sanction hearing.

MS TOUBE: Understood. The position will, of course, be no matter what the FCA says, the company will say: "We fully dispute all of this."

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MS TOUBE: So, all they will hear is what the FCA has done and thinks and says, coupled with the company saying, "We dispute this," but----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. The concern being raised is that it is difficult for them to make an informed decision about the cost-benefit analysis without some further information as to the basis for the FCA's analysis.

MS TOUBE: I understand the point being made, and your Ladyship is right. Insofar as there is any
point there, it is a point for sanction, but I also agree that if there is more that we can say with the FCA's-- well, once the FCA exercises its discretion, because it is really a matter for them, then if they exercise their discretion for us to be able to say more, then we will be able to say more. So, that is absolutely understood. I do not think I had any other specific -- but there are two other points I did have. One was on the voting form, and the question that my learned friend Mr Bompas raised about who can vote. Then, the second question is timetable.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Well, why do you not deal with everything? Then I will hear from everyone else on everything.

MS TOUBE: Thank you. So, what Mr Bompas says is, if I can put it this way: "What do we do in this situation where you have got somebody who had a Scheme Claim at the record date, so they were holding their shares at the record date, and then between then and now has sold it, so that that person is no longer -- and sells it with the claim attached to it?"

COUNSEL: Without.
MS TOUBE: There are two situations: so, sells
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it with the claim attached to it. In that case, the person who is the purchaser will be the Scheme Claimant and will be the person who receives the money. If the person who sells it post-suspension keeps the claim, so does not sell the claim on, keeps the claim----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Does not assign the claim on----

MS TOUBE: Does not assign the claim on, so that the shares go here, but the claim stays here. What happens in relation to that? The answer is the vendor remains the creditor, because that is the person with the Scheme Claim, and the person who is now the beneficial owner will say, "Well, I am the beneficial owner," and will be the person who actually gets paid some money out of the trust because they are the person who is the beneficial owner. So, you have got a different person who is the person who is the Scheme Claimant, and the person who gets paid money.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MS TOUBE: The answer to that is there should be some agreement between these two people as to what happens to those proceeds.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. You say that that is
a matter to be dealt with in the sale
MS TOUBE: Exactly, and we say it is really a matter for them, that as far as we are concerned, we need to know who is the person voting, and then, who does the Scheme pay out? If those two people are not the same person and they have not made any arrangements between them, that is a matter----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: It will be fractured but that is a matter for then the seller going for (inaudible). All right.

MS TOUBE: Exactly. So, I think that is the answer to that. My learned friend says, "Well, that is not fair because if he has given his shares to his grandchildren and they do not give him back the money, then it means he loses out, even though he is the Scheme Claimant." And the answer is, "Well, we cannot legislate for all circumstances."

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. Well, I am sure that this must arise in numerous Schemes

MS TOUBE: It does, and this is how it is dealt with.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. All right, but was there anything other specific you wanted to say about the voting form? I see that there have been very considerable amendments to it.
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## MS TOUBE: There have, and I should say in

 fairness that that has been a very useful conversation that we have had with my learned friends and with various other people to make changes to it. We want the voting form to be as clear as possible, and we think we have now got to a-- it is not ever going to be a perfect form. My learned friend points out he has picked up typos. Well, that is -- but that is drafting issues. So, there is nothing else specifically I wanted to say about the voting form.MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. Timetable
MS TOUBE: Timetable. So, the current timetable is the one we set out in our skeleton argument at para.86. So, the notice of the meeting is 17 October. The deadline to submit forms establishing that you are a creditor is 23 November. 4 December is the vote, and then 15 December is the sanction hearing. It has been said by my learned friend, Mr Bompas, and various others, although not the Investor Advocate who thinks that this timing is sensible, that that is not enough time to consider things. What we say in response to that is, well, that is about seven weeks between the documents going out on 17 October, and the vote on 4 December.
twelve and a half weeks from the PSL. So, it is already quite a bit of time and that should be enough for people to read these documents and decide how to vote. As I said to your Ladyship at the last hearing, although there is no particular drop-dead date, we do want to get money out to the Scheme Creditors as soon as possible, assuming that the vote is achieved and the Scheme is sanctioned.

My learned friend has suggested that the vote should be-- that the registration to vote should be just before Christmas, and that the sanction hearing should be in January, so effectively pushing everything a month. Now, ultimately, we are in your Ladyship's hands about what the dates should be for this, but the bottom line is we think it is enough time and we want to get on with paying people, and that is the short point.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. I am aware that as time goes on the legal costs will increase, so actually, for there to be a shorter timetable gives a greater amount of money in the settlement fund ultimately, for the investors.

MS TOUBE: Yes. We also do not necessarily think that having more time over Christmas is going 29

## to be particularly helpful.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No. All right. Thank you very much, Ms Toube. So, who is going to comment next? Is there anyone on, if I might sort of colloquially say, your side of the court, who wants to comment further, so FCA? No.

MR HAYWOOD: No, my Lady.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Investor Advocate.
SUBMISSIONS by Miss COOKE
MISS COOKE: Just a few brief points from the Investor Advocate's perspective. First of all, in terms of the documentation, we have provided our feedback and I do not have anything further to say on that. Secondly, notification to Scheme Creditors. The Investor Advocate notes that the use of the platforms is consistent with the communication routes to investors that they have signed up for, and we are content with what is proposed by the company and welcome the suggestion that the platforms are asked to confirm that they will draw attention to the fact that communications are urgent.

In terms of the timetable, as your Ladyship is well aware, not all Scheme Creditors speak with one voice. Your Ladyship will have submissions of
others, but in terms of the Investor Advocate's position, I think it is worth flagging that issues about the timetable have not been a theme in the communications received by the Investor Advocate. Indeed, we received one email about short notice before the convening hearing, but nothing about the timetable more generally, and your Ladyship has seen the schedule in the supplemental bundle, and there are a number of emails there to the effect that the process should be taken forward, and essentially, that the process should be got on with.

The Investor Advocate does consider that it would be in the interest of the creditors to proceed on the basis of the timetable proposed by the company. A key aspect of the Scheme is obviously payment to creditors as soon as possible, and it is considered that there should not be any unnecessary delay in giving Scheme Creditors the opportunity to consider if that is what they want, and if the Scheme is approved and sanctioned, receiving payments in due course. Your Ladyship also has already made the point about costs. Whilst there have been various amendments to paperwork as well, the substance, as Ms Toube said, has been set out in the PSL some time ago, so we do consider that the

## timetable that the company proposes to be appropriate.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Thank you very much. So, Mr Bompas, and then I will hear from any other investors.

SUBMISSIONS by Mr BOMPAS
MR BOMPAS: Yes. My Lady, the essential point, I think, is that having reached your Ladyship's conclusion on class, it is now, and absent anything obviously wrong with the Scheme, for the Scheme to go ahead, driven by the company, who will explain the Scheme and arrange the voting and so on and so forth, with the risk - - It may be that when they come to the sanction hearing, the Scheme is rejected because there has been something that has gone wrong with the process, either in the way that the Scheme is explained, in its formulation, or in the communication.

Now, over the time since 5 October, in the evening, when we handed in the papers, there has been a very extensive dialogue between those instructing Clifford Chance most materially since the hearing, to try and iron out some of these difficulties, having regard to your Ladyship's comment that it would be unfortunate if (inaudible)
for example, had been taken at the sanction hearing, which might have been dealt with now. So, we have tried our very best, but the time pressure is huge.

Your Ladyship noted a typing error. I have noted myself three in the Scheme itself, including in the provision that deals with the amendment of the Scheme to correct anything that has gone wrong. So, it is rushed, and that is not a-- it means that there are little glitches. One example I can take out of the Scheme is on standstill. There is a standstill in place, pending the Scheme being terminated or becoming ineffective. Limitation is dealt with as regards the company. There is no limitation point going to be taken. The standstill applies to third parties: officers and auditors and all sorts of people, and there is no way in which the limitation is, if you like, no longer an issue for those people. This is in cl. 2 of the Scheme, I think. It is a smallish point.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: But are you expecting me to deal with that now?

MR BOMPAS: No. I am not. I am just illustrating that we have tried and we are trying hard to help but, ultimately, it is going to be after today probably over to the company. We do not
want to be hung up if there are points that actually when one looks at with adequate time, turn out to be wrong.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: So, exactly when do you say that more time needs to be built in?

MR BOMPAS: Well, to my mind, you see, the starting point, 17 October to send out the documents is very short. There is still a work in progress. Your Ladyship would have had a bundle of 300 pages amended this morning. We had the bundle delivered in the morning of the 10th. We had another bundle I think that came at-- I think midnight on-- yes, on the 10th. So, Clifford Chance-- I mean, it is not a criticism ; they have been working very hard, but the fact is they are under huge pressure, and it struck me that 17 October is going to impose further pressure.

Then, a point was made in the previous hearing that 15 December is, I think, allotted for the sanction hearing, one day. Well, that is before Christmas. If anything goes wrong, if the hearing takes longer than a day, who knows what will happen? So, our suggestion has been really in order to avoid the Scheme becoming derailed for avoidable mistakes.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, let us go through
> your proposals. When exactly do you say that the notice should be sent to the Scheme Creditors? How much more time do you want, bearing in mind that every day that goes by there are further legal fees being incurred, and there is a law of diminishing returns?

> MR BOMPAS: There is.
> MRS JUSTICE BACON: At some point, people have to stop correcting typos and asking for things to be phrased in different ways. Realistically, now you have had the Explanatory Statement for some time, how long-- how much more do you need to comment on it?

> MR BOMPAS: I mean, if one imagines that my-if one takes it that my solicitors are given another five days to work on the documents, that puts us into next week already, and the 17 th $I$ think is Tuesday next. So, you know----

> MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, what about extending that to the 20th? That would give you until-- I mean, if the Scheme document-- if the notice is to be sent out on the 20th, when is the last day that Clifford Chance will need to have comments - 18th, 19th?

> MR BOMPAS: (Inaudible) what they are -18 th.
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: The 18th.
MS TOUBE: Yes, my Lady, 18th.
MR BOMPAS: Then there is going to be the question of whether that affects the voting date, which is at the moment 4 December. We would suggest (inaudible) that should be pushed back, because at the moment there is allowing approximately 10 days between the voting and the hearing. My learned friend would say----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, to be honest, if-An extra three days here or there is not, I do not think, going to make very much difference at that stage. You are saying you need a bit more time now to comment on the documents. If you get until the 18th, which is almost a week from now, the documents go out on the 20th. The deadline for submitting a claim form to vote on the Scheme is then more than a month away, one----

MR BOMPAS: Well, I think I would have to say that if the deadline for voting is not to be changed, I will not be thanked for having had time shortened from the generality of the investors.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Why is it necessary for there to be more than a month from the notice of the Scheme meeting to the deadlines for submitting a

```
claim form to vote on the Scheme? That is not
making a decision as to-- I am going to come in a
minute to the Scheme meeting, but why is it
necessary to have longer than 23 November?
    MR BOMPAS: There is a practical point. Your
Ladyship has heard from investors and knows that
investors have complained about short times.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, but they are not
deciding at that point. They are just putting in a
claim form to vote. Why do they need more than a
month to decide if they are even going to make their
voice heard?
    MR BOMPAS: Well, they need to decide how they
are going to vote.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: No. Not at that point, do
they? They just have to put in a claim form to say
that they would like to vote. Why do they need more
than a month to make a decision as to whether they
would like to say something?
    MR BOMPAS: And that they fill in the form,
which is quite an elaborate form, correctly
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: How long is the form?
    MR BOMPAS: It is now, I think, about 8 pages--
13 pages, and it has quite a lot of detail in it,
and it is going to take quite a lot of scrutiny.
```
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: Why does that take more than a month? No. I would like a realistic answer. Why does it take more than a month for somebody to put in a claim----

MR BOMPAS: I have been reminded that a platform can take two weeks to communicate, so one takes time to get the information out to the investors, and we have heard from some of the investors why more needs to be done to persuade the platforms to move matters forward.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, if we were to allow another three days, that would take us to, let us say, 27 November, to put it the other side of the weekend. That means that there is no less time than there would be. In fact, there is one more day at that stage, if that is 27 November, to submit a claim form to vote on the Scheme. How long do you want between the court meeting and a sanction hearing?

MR BOMPAS: Frankly, I would have thought longer than is presently allowed for, (inaudible) 4 December and 15 December. I would have thought, you see, that one is talking about having at least a fortnight.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Having----
time.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Can I just ask the company, is there a problem if the court meeting happens before the vacation and the sanction hearing happens after the vacation? Does that cause logistical problems?

MR AL-ATTAR(?): No, it just delays payment.
MS TOUBE: Yes. It does not cause a logistical problem; it just delays payment out at the other end.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right, but if all of the investors who want to make representations say that they want there to be a month's delay, and everyone has had the opportunity to comment----

MS TOUBE: Yes, I suppose that there are two points here. The first is all the investors who are here--I noticed that, in some of the comments, some
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of the investors just said they wanted to get on with it, and the Investor Advocate has also said they think that the current timetable is effective, but the answer is, if your Ladyship wishes to give more time to them now, then the sanction hearing could take place in January.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. So, what I am wondering about is whether the court meeting should then go ahead on, say, something like 15 December. I am reluctant to push it too far close to Christmas because people will have plans for the Christmas week. I think that is probably the latest that it could be, and then the sanction hearing would then need to be as early as possible in the new term, perhaps on 12 January.

MS TOUBE: I did actually make enquiries as to when the court had availability in January, just in case your Ladyship were to ask this, and the earliest of those dates we were offered was 18 January.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, all right. Well, then it could be 18 January.

MS TOUBE: I do not know if that still exists,
but as of this morning, it existed.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, so I could say, "The
first available date in the new term of January," and that will be fixed without regard to counsel, I think, because it needs to go ahead at that point.

MS TOUBE: I think that might-- that probably

## would cause costs issues.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: I see. All right. Well, the first available-- I mean, do you both have availability in the first couple of weeks of January?

MS TOUBE: I do, yes.
MR BOMPAS: I certainly do, if I am going to be----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: You would?
MR BOMPAS: I mean, this assumes, at the moment, of course, the vote has gone in favour of the Scheme.

MS TOUBE: Well, if it does not, then we do not need to worry about this.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, all right. So, then the first available date which counsel can attend and the court will be available in January. So, can I just check, this is the timetable that I would propose having regard to the numerous comments about the timing: final comments to Clifford Chance by 18 October; the Scheme notice to be sent out by the
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20th; deadline to submit claim form, 27 November; Scheme meeting 15 December; and then the sanction hearing to be the first available date in January in the new term. Are there any comments on that timetable? I will obviously hear the individual investors, but I would like comments from counsel first.

MR BOMPAS: My Lady, what has been pointed out to me is that the voting form will actually probably qualify as the giving of the votes by many, many, many of the investors. Although there is the Scheme meeting, the voting on the Scheme technically will take place, at the moment, on the 15 th. So, what those instructing me suggested was that the deadline for the submission of the voting forms should go back, while the Scheme meeting could stay on the 15th.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: What date are you asking for? 1 December? The 1st is the Friday, is it not? MR BOMPAS: Yes, my Lady, it would either be the Friday the 1st, or it would be Monday the 4th. MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. I think Friday, 1 December, because then that gives two weeks before the Scheme meeting. Just-- All right.

MS TOUBE: My Lady, the point that has been
made from behind me is sort of the flipside of the point that my learned friend is making, which is we do not need such a long time between the deadline to submit the votes and the meeting. So, I do not think we would have a problem with the deadline to submit votes being moved to, say, 1 December, but the meeting itself could be a week earlier. I know none of this is going to help us to get a sanction hearing earlier, because that is in any event going to have to be January, but it would at least allow us to start putting together the documents, the Chairman's report and all the rest of it.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, I see, and I am mindful of the Christmas vacation. Well, Mr Bompas, what about bringing forward the date of the Scheme meeting in light of that comment?

MR BOMPAS: Well, I was actually, my Lady, going to suggest the other way round: put the voting form to 4 December and leave the Scheme meeting on the 15th. Then, (inaudible) we will try work to get 18 January, if that is suitable.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: So, you are saying that the real issue for your clients and other investors is the date for the voting form?

MR BOMPAS: Correct.
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: Would the company have a problem with the voting form going in on the 4th, which is just the other side of the weekend, and then keeping the Scheme meeting on the 15th? I know that is not going to help you with getting the Chairman's reports and everything together, but there is the whole of the following week before Christmas, and then there you are going to get at least two weeks into January.

MS TOUBE: So, I think, if that is what your Ladyship wishes to order, that is what we will have. So: 18 October for comments on the documents; 20 October, notice of the meeting with all the documents going out; 4 December, the deadline to submit votes; 15 December, the meeting; and then the-- whatever date it is in January - 18th if we can get it - for the sanction hearing. The only thing that-- We can live with that timetable, I should say. The only thing that we would like to be able to do is that, if any person is going to raise points at the sanction hearing, it would be good to build in dates prior to that hearing for people to raise their grounds of opposition, put in evidence, and then put in proper submissions before the hearing, because whoever hears the sanction hearing,

```
I think, will wish to avoid a lot of last-minute
documents and emails.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. Well, can I deal with
that as a matter of directions after I have heard
from the individual investors? Because I am aware
that they have come here, they want to make
submissions.
    MS TOUBE: Absolutely.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: They have heard what we
have had to say. The timetable, now, has been
revised to give them, I think, considerably more
time, which I hope will alleviate some of the
concerns, and there will then be the period over
Christmas for them to consider whether to object to
sanction on grounds of fairness if the Scheme has
been approved at the court meeting. So, let me see.
Mr Bompas, your comments only addressed the
timetable. Was there anything else that you want to
say?
    MR BOMPAS: Well, what I think-- I flag up the
point about what I say is the mismatch between
Scheme Creditors and investors holding units or
shares. My learned friend has addressed your
Ladyship on that. I am not going to take time
dealing with the point before your Ladyship, as your
```
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Ladyship wishes, but I actually, for my own part,
consider the submission made mistaken, that there is
an issue, and I would hope that we can bottom that
out with Clifford Chane.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, well, you can have
more dialogue and that can then be brought back
before the court at the sanction hearing.
MR BOMPAS: Well, but fundamentally this is a
problem with those promoting the Scheme rather than
the court resolve at this stage.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, all right. Thank you
very much, Mr Bompas. Now, who else do I need to
hear from now? Are there any other investors that
want to make specific comments too? That is Mr
Agathangelou and Mr Bishop. Who is going to go
first?
MR AGATHANGELOU: I will, my Lady, thank you
MRS JUSTICE BACON: And you are?
MR AGATHANGELOU: My name is Andy Agathangelou.
Would you like me to speak from here, my Lady, or go
somewhere else?
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, is there any problem
with the audio if you speak from there? Because I
do not think that there are any microphones, so
perhaps you could just come forward and find
yourself in the vicinity of a microphone so that those-- I can see that the space is being made for you on the front bench. Can you just comment briefly - - This is not an opportunity for you to tell the court all your concerns about the fund or points that may be relevant to whether or not investors are going to vote in favour or against the Scheme. All I want to hear from you now, and all that is appropriate for you to make submissions on now, is the process going forward.

SUBMISSION by Mr AGATHANGELOU
MR AGATHANGELOU: Thank you, my Lady. Thank you very much, my Lady, for the opportunity to speak. If I may share frankly with yourself and the court the general sentiment amongst many investors about the process thus far, and therefore about the process moving forward.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, I think we just-- In the time available - - This hearing has to finish at one. Let us concentrate on the process going forward, and rather than making general concerns, please can you make specific proposals about what I have just ordered?

MR AGATHANGELOU: Thank you. In general terms,
what we would like to see as investors is a far
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greater degree of investor participation in the process. We believe there are several points, that my colleague Mark Bishop will elaborate on shortly, that are absolutely vital to be done correctly to help ensure that the process is and is seen to be fair, and without sufficient investor representation, there is, we believe, my Lady, a real risk that we'll get to the sanction hearing and tens of thousands of people will look back at what's happened and feel uncomfortable about the degree of fairness. What investors are looking for is an opportunity to ensure that their concerns are adequately dealt with.

Now, of course, there has been an Investor Advocate in position, as you will have heard from the sentiments expressed on Tuesday, my Lady. The role of the Investor Advocate, of course, is not to champion the investor. Also, my Lady, there is the Investor Committee, and we've had no line of sight at all, frankly, on the inputs of the Investor Committee. I do believe they will be publishing a report after the decision today has been made. Therefore, in very straightforward terms, my Lady, we need a part of the system in the process that adequately champions the true interests of the
investors, and of course, my Lady, there are perhaps as many as 100,000 people who are literally unrepresented because, for example, they're not part of the Leigh Day class or the Harcus Parker class, and we know, my Lady, from a meeting that was held a couple of days ago with over a hundred investors who are genuinely concerned about the levels of transparency around the entire process, and of course, if there is a lack of transparency, the feeling is that there is a lack of fairness. What we're essentially asking for is the opportunity for investors' concerns to be properly championed by investors. Thank you, my Lady.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Can I just ask, how do you say that that should be dealt with in the order that I am going to be making today? So, starting with the timetable, are you content with the timetable that I have just thrashed out with counsel?

MR AGATHANGELOU: Yes, we are, my Lady. What we would like to see, however, is a third group constituting of a small number of individuals who are absolutely dedicated to championing the representation of the investors. They would work alongside and in partnership with the Investor Advocate and the Investor Committee, but they would
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be free to have their own thoughts that they would be free to express directly to the court. We think this is a very pragmatic approach, and it will significantly advance the effectiveness of the process.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: When you say you would like to express those views to the court, you presumably mean at the sanction hearing in January?

MR AGATHANGELOU: At the sanction hearing in January, but also in the process between now and then.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: There is no court involvement in the process between now and then?

MR AGATHANGELOU: In the interaction with the other parties involved in the process, my Lady. I clearly am not legally trained, you' II appreciate that, that's very clear to you. We are simply asking for a pragmatic opportunity to feed in thoughts and ideas, and frankly, concerns to help ensure that everybody can look back at the end of the sanction hearing and feel that the process has been fair. At the bottom of p.14, my Lady, of the Investor Advocate report, there's reference to the importance of this process being seen to be fair. At the top of p.15, my Lady, on the Investor

Advocate report, it makes reference to the idea that there should not be a blot on the Scheme, a blot, and we currently feel that the blot on the Scheme is that it is not sufficiently fair, and my colleague Mark Bishop will elaborate on some detail around that, and when he speaks, he'll be talking about ideas that cannot be put right today, my Lady, but could be put right if a third cohort representing the interests of true investors was established and invited to be part of the process. We think that would mean we could look back on things in months to come, and at least everybody could feel the process has been fair. Thank you, my Lady.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Thank you very much, Mr Agathangelou. So, I will hear from Mr Bishop now, thank you, and again, Mr Bishop, just to reiterate, I do not want to hear submissions on points that go to the ultimate fairness at the sanction hearing. What I want to deal now is procedural points, process, how we manage the process going forward.

MR BISHOP: Thank you. I stress I'm not legally qualified, but I will make the distinction as best I can.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Of course.
SUBMISSIONS by Mr BISHOP
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MR BISHOP: There are three areas I'd like to deal with. The first one is to do with the Explanatory Statement. One point that I think has not been sufficiently recognised in proceedings so far is that those private investors who signed up to the various group litigations constitute, at most, 20 per cent of the totality. Therefore, 80 per cent of the totality are not covered. We think that the only communications they're likely to have received so far are a small number of communications from platforms. We think that statements have been downloaded perhaps around 20,000 times, and what's been published on the FCA's website -- and hopefully, of those 20,000 , many of them have read the practice statement letter.

We believe that what they received, at the moment, is quite significantly inadequate in relation to the depiction of the restitution order, which for those 80 per cent, is the only counterfactual really available to them, and you've talked - - I'm very grateful, my Lady, that you have raised the issue of the Warning Notice. We do agree, from our reading of the document - we're not lawyers - that it isn't possible to release it in its entirety. Even with the permission of the
parties, it seems that they cannot publish it, but as you rightly observed, they can publish a very detailed summary, which may be very similar in substance and content. We'd just like to stress that we think it's really important that it is detailed and that the summary is accurate because, particularly in respect to the Financial Conduct Authority, I'm sure you're aware there have been cases, not least its summary of the s. 166 report into RBS and the alleged banking misconduct towards small businesses, where a published summary turned out subsequently to be inaccurate because somebody had leaked the full report. I'm not at all suggesting that would happen here, but I think the quality of that summary is important.

I also think there's an issue with the Final Notice, my Lady. I'm not aware of any legal restrictions on those things being published. Obviously, the FCA would need to get the permission of the parties mentioned in it to provide information under s. 348 of FSMA, but I would have thought that Link would agree to that if it was wanting information to be put into the explanatory notice-- Explanatory Statement, so hopefully, that can be done. Also, I notice that it is intended
currently that the Final Notice will in any case be published if the scheme is proved, so if they can publish it then, why not publish it now so that it could be of use to people?

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, there is a distinction between the Warning Notice, which is protected from publication, and the Decision which is not.

MR BISHOP: Of course, so what we're arguing is, would it be possible to publish the Decision Notice - the Final Notice, as it's called - before people get to vote on the Scheme? Because they would then be able to judge the quality of the case that the FCA has against Link.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, I think that is not going to be possible, because it is part of the settlement agreement that will not be done until after the Scheme has been sanctioned, because if the Scheme is not sanctioned, then everything would be contested vigorously by LFSL. If it is sanctioned, then they will effectively let this go through without contesting it, but without an admission of liability. Their position depends on whether a sanction is given or not. That is why there is that distinction made, and why, as far as I understand it
> - and of course, the FCA can correct me on that - it is not possible for the final decision to be adopted before the sanction of the scheme.

> MR BISHOP: Okay, thank you. I understand that that may be the case, and in that case, I' II just leave on the table the question of whether it's possible to publish a full and extensive summary.

> MRS JUSTICE BACON: More detail of the Warning Notice.

> MR BISHOP: Exactly. Also, are there any legal opinions that the FCA has sought about the likely prospects of a restitution order that it could publish? I don't know the answer, but if there is, I think that would be very helpful to that 80 per cent or thereabouts of investors. The second area that I'd like to raise is about participation levels. We're all aware that there is fundamentally a structural problem with this Scheme arrangement vote, which is that, in an ideal world, Link would be writing to the underlying investors, but the platforms are not allowed to give them, under GDPR, the contact details of those investors, so they cannot do it. We don't know how much effort the FCA will put into encouraging platforms to circulate the message or when they will do it, and absolutely
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rightly, my Lady, you've emphasised the importance of it. I wonder whether it's worth having, as well as a carrot on a stick, which is perhaps-- I don't know whether you have the right to impose some minimum participation level for the vote to be deemed to be valid. In other words, of all of the universal investors, particularly private investors, is it possible that you can require a certain percentage of them to actually participate?

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, that is an issue for the sanction hearing.

MR BISHOP: Okay.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: If there is a concern about participation, that is typically an issue that is raised after the sanction hearing, and of course, you would be able to make submissions on that if there is a very, very low participation.

MR BISHOP: Thank you, and then the final issue I'd like to raise - - this is something which, as non-lawyers, we are not clear about, so I apologise in advance if there is clarity of the answer. I believe that approximately 15 per cent, by value of the fund, was held at suspension by another fund, the Hargreaves Lansdown Multi-Manager Fund, known as MMF. That fund, of course, has a number-- a very
large number of private investors in it. It's unclear to us whether and how there will be voting in respect of this holding. Will Hargreaves Lansdown, the fund's manager, vote as it sees fit and be deemed an institutional investor, or will it make an effort to contact the underlying investors in that fund? There is a related issue, my Lady, at risk of complicating matters more significantly, which is, of course, this is an open-ended fund, and it 's been trading ever since the Link Fund was suspended back in 2019. Its investors today are very different than its investors were when the gating occurred. Which group of people would vote? And also, which group----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: We are talking about the Hargreaves Lansdown----

MR BISHOP: Yes, in the Hargreaves Lansdown fund, my Lady, their investors today will mostly be different people than the investors four and a third years ago, and who will receive the money as well? Will the money go to the people who were investors when the fund was gated, or the people who are investors now, many of whom may not have been subject to that gating? It's a complex issue.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Thank you very much. Thank
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you to both you and Mr Agathangelou for your written submissions and your oral submissions. I am now going to give the company, and insofar as appropriate others, a chance to respond to those. Thank you. So, Ms Toube, do you want to run through the points raised by the two individual investors? Oh, actually, perhaps before I do so, can I just say, is there anybody else who is wanting to make submissions on the part of the individual investors?

MR AGATHANGELOU: My Lady, forgive me, one further thought. You posed a question to me about what the practicalities could be about some additional representation from investing, and it's just occurred to me, in response to you on that point, that perhaps there could be some additional representatives from investors on the Investor Committee. There therefore would not need to be an additional entity created, there would simply be better representation of people like us and the people we represent on that committee. Thank you.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Thank you, that is a helpful suggestion. Can I just check there is nobody else who wants to make submissions? No? All right, Ms Toube.

SUBMISSIONS in reply by MS TOUBE

MS TOUBE: So, in relation to the Investor Committee, there is no further role for that committee going forwards, so it will not be doing anything. It did, of course, ask for people to sit on it, and had a good representation from individual investors, and its report has already been published, as your Ladyship knows, so that is already out there. Insofar as the investors want to discuss with each other or band together, that is really a matter for them. I do not think that we can build in any further position for them. It is now a matter for the scheme creditors how they choose to vote.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, and I understand your point is that, if they want to get together as a group and make submissions as a group and discuss as a group and decide and enable all of those in the group to discuss how they wish to vote, and indeed, to come together as a group to make representations at the sanction hearing, they can actually do that.
There is nothing which stops them from doing that.
MS TOUBE: No, nothing at all.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: No.
MS TOUBE: So, I think that is the point in relation to that. The point in relation to the FCA
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you have already heard submissions on before, so I do not think I need to deal with that again. In relation to the question of participation, as your Ladyship rightly says, that is going to be a matter for sanction. Insofar as it was suggested, I think, in a couple of the submissions I have seen although I still have not seen Mr Pyatt's additional emails - that somehow the statutory voting thresholds could be changed, they cannot. The statute says 75 per cent of those by value voting at the meeting, so the court can, as your Ladyship rightly says, look at participation, but it cannot adjust the statutory levels.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, it is then a matter of the discretion of the court as to whether to sanction the scheme.

MS TOUBE: Absolutely right.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Between considerations of fairness and whether there is some block or defect in the scheme.

MS TOUBE: Absolutely right. The point in relation to Hargreaves Lansdown - - I think that is two points, as a potential target of a third - party claim, and as potentially being able to vote. That conflict point we did deal with in our skeleton at
para.84, and your Ladyship may recall that there is actually no conflict because there is no release of the claim against Hargreaves Lansdown, so Hargreaves Lansdown cannot vote on a particular way to avoid a claim being made against it because the Scheme does not stop that claim being made. The second point, I think, was who is the right person to vote, and that is going to be a question of the underlying contract between the investor and the platform. When the votes are cast, they will have to be scrutinised to make sure that they are being cast by the right person, and if Hargreaves Lansdown is under the contract with the investor, the right person, then they can vote and if not they are not.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes----
MS TOUBE: So I am not sure what else we can do on that.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, so if I can then summarise for the benefit of the investors who are here and those who are online. The last suggested solution of adding people to the investor committee will not work because they are effectively functus. There is not any further role for them in the process going forward, but insofar as the investors want to group together, in however many groups, to

## 61

make submissions on the Explanatory Statement before the 18 th and then thereafter too to meet together and consider the materials so that the individual investors can decide how to vote, and then thereafter, after the court meeting, to make any submissions as a group to the court at the sanction hearing they are free to do so; nothing prevents them from doing so.

MS TOUBE: Yes, my Lady.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: And I do not need to make any order at that stage, because they can group together in as many or as few groupings as they want. To do that, the court will, of course, consider submissions from the investors if they want to at the sanction hearing. Of course, I think it would be more useful to the court if submissions are made on behalf of a group of investors rather than lots of submissions to the same effect being made by individual investors, but that is a matter for them. All right, so that is your position. Does anyone else, Mr Bompas, Ms Cook or Mr Smith, want to say anything about those issues that have been raised by Mr Agathangelou and Mr Bishop? No? Mr Bompas.

MR BOMPAS: I have got a point on costs in the order, but that is my only remaining point, I think.
could term - - - -

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, you do not need to----
MR AGATHANGELOU: -- to be a Woodford Campaign
Group, could the Woodford Campaign Group be that relevant (inaudible) for example?

MRS JUSTICE BACON: You do not need to create
any legal entity. I mean, I could simply hear
submissions from a couple of individuals
representing and, in an informal way, a group of
investors, or you could do it through a campaign group.

MR AGATHANGELOU: Okay. Thank you very much,
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## my Lady.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: As I said, it is more useful to the court if submissions are grouped together rather than that I hear lots of individual submissions.

MR AGATHANGELOU: Thank you, my Lady.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right, thank you, and so I need to deal with costs.

MR BOMPAS: My Ladyship, I had a brief conversation with my learned friend this morning, and there is a certain amount of learning on the question of costs of parties, such as myself, on a hearing such as this, but one of the ways of dealing with that is to reserve the costs, and that is what I think-- I hope has been agreed, but arising out of that is going to be the form of order. At the end of a form of order, para. 19 gives the company liberty to restore rather, and para. 20 has an automatic restoration if the Scheme is approved. There is just the possibility that the Scheme might fail, you see, on the voting, and then there would be the question of costs which would need to be restored. So what I would be proposing is that the order should be amended to reserve the costs of the represented parties before your Ladyship.

```
generally?
```

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Of costs reserved

MR BOMPAS: And then with the liberty to restore made general rather than limited to the company. So in the event that the costs do need to be sorted out, other than at the sanction hearing there is a plain way of doing it.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Is 19 not doing it? Well,
I mean, if you think that 19 does not do it ----
MR BOMPAS: It would not give my clients liberty to restore if the company did not.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No. All right.
MR BOMPAS: I mean, I can understand why it may have been put in there, but ----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: No, so you just want
liberty to apply generally for further----
MR BOMPAS: Correct, correct.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: -- directions on this matter? That seems to me to be the case.

MR BOMPAS: And then the other point, which I think was raised, which may be outstanding, is whether your Ladyship is to give directions for submissions----

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MR BOMPAS: -- before the hearing?
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Is liberty to apply generally and cost reserved agreed?

MS TOUBE: Cost reserved is agreed. Yes. I think as long as it is clear that the liberty to restore is in relation to the cost question, we do not have a problem in relation to that.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Is it in relation to the cost question?

MR BOMPAS: That is what I had in mind, specifically.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. All right, then you will then insert the appropriate wording in the draft order. So----

MS TOUBE: So, the draft order is going to have to be amended to change the dates, in any event?

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes, and then directions.
MS TOUBE: Yes, so I was trying to work out working backwards from the hearing. The first thing I can tell your Ladyship is that we have moved the hearing to 18 January.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right, so someone has discussed with the court, so that is going to be the 18th.

MS TOUBE: Yes, so the court has now moved it for us. Working back from that then, skeleton
arguments, that is a Thursday, I should say.
Skeleton arguments should be 4 p.m. on Monday 15.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: That seems sensible.
MS TOUBE: Bundles should be 4 p.m. on Friday 12.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
MS TOUBE: Now, the other thing we need to deal with is grounds of opposition, and that, I should emphasise, your Ladyship may or may not have seen these before, but usually it is a sort of very high-level position paper, these "I'm going to take a point on fairness based on the $X$ plan." So it is not a mini skeleton, and it is possible that there might be some evidence that might need to be served with that. I suspect in this case there will not be, but there might be. So, we would need grounds of opposition and evidence in support of that, and we would need some reply evidence. So what we thought might work is, with the meeting on 15 December, the grounds of opposition and any evidence in support could come in on 21 December, and that will mean the result of the meeting is known and this high-level document can be produced, and then the reply evidence can come in on 11 January, so just before the bundles.
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MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, that does not give very much time for anyone want to put in skeleton arguments?

MS TOUBE: Well, if it is much earlier, then it is all the way across Christmas.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: What about the 9th?
MS TOUBE: I am hopeful there will not be any evidence at all, but yes, I think we can do the 9 th.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. I mean, I am aware that that still already falls within the court vacation, but----

MS TOUBE: It does.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: -- one would hope that it gives sufficient time for everybody who has been on their individual vacations to deal with that. All right, so the proposal is then starting with the court meeting; the court meeting will be on the 15th; grounds of opposition and evidence and support on the 21st, which is the last day of term; reply evidence on 9 January, which does fall within the vacation but hopefully that will give enough time; and bundles on the 12th; skeletons on 15 January. Does anybody wish to dispute that timetable?

MR BOMPAS: My Lady, what I would caution is this, that the results of the meeting may not be
known immediately upon the conclusion of the meeting, and the date of 21 December was premised on the result of the meeting being known on the 15 th. Now, it is probable that the result will be known swiftly, but there has to be the possibility that this counting of votes takes longer and the result of the meeting is pushed back.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: How could it take longer? I presume it is going to be done through - - At least if it is a hybrid meeting, almost all the votes will be electronic.

MR BOMPAS: Well, one would hope so. I am only repeating what was suggested in the Explanatory Statement and the papers before the court.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Well, how could it take longer than 15 December for the result to be known?

MS TOUBE: The answer is, normally it does not, but in this case, we would have to check that the votes are by the right people. So the only way to deal with this might be to move the meeting back from 15 December and keep 21 December, because otherwise we cannot keep 18 January as a sanction meeting.

MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. I do not want to move 18 January. So Mr Bompas, if you wanted that, we
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```
could to move the meeting back to, say, the 13th?
    MR BOMPAS: Those instructing me are content
that the Scheme meeting itself should be held on the
13th.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Right, so the meeting will
be held on the 13th. Then is there any reason why
it would take more than two days to count the votes?
    MS TOUBE: So, I am being told by one of the
proposers-- well, one of the Scheme supervisors that
the answer is not normally, probably it would be
fine----
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
    MS TOUBE: -- but he cannot guarantee it,
because it, as I say, if people are putting in
screenshots and the sorts of issues my learned
friend come up----
    DIRECTIONS
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes.
    MR BOMPAS: Yes.
    MRS JUSTICE BACON: So, that is then recorded
now, because obviously, if the outcome is not known
by the 15th, it is unrealistic to ask for grounds of
opposition, and evidence and support to be put in on
the 21st, and then we would have to revisit the
timetable.
```

MS TOUBE: Yes and no is the answer to that. I
hear what your Ladyship says, but obviously, if the outcome of the meeting is that it does not pass,
then no evidence needs to go in at all.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: Yes. I am sorry, yes.
Depending under the circumstances, depending on what
is known on the 15th, it may be unrealistic.
MS TOUBE: Yes. Understood.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: And the company will have
to take a view, and obviously, if that view is
disagreed with by everybody else, then that would be
a matter for the court of sanction hearing, and if
they have not had time to put in their grounds of
opposition and so on. Is there anybody here who
wants to comment on the timetable that has just been
proposed? No? All right. Is there anything else
that I need to deal with, apart from saying that I
hope to get a draft order by the end of the day?
MS TOUBE: No, my Lady, and we will do our best
to do that.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: All right. Anything else,
Mr Bompas?
MR BOMPAS: No.
MRS JUSTICE BACON: No. All right. Thank you
very much.
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[^0]:    I think that should be noted. It is obvious that you have all done a lot of work. I know there are some remaining concerns, but you did do what I asked you to do, and I think everyone will appreciate that you reached out and invited comments on that. So, thank you and thank you to those behind you as well.

    MS TOUBE: Thank you, and I should say those behind me have not slept very much, so I have already told them how grateful I am to them for having done that. You will also have seen that Clifford Chance responded to a lot of these various bits and pieces. It is true to say that 23, I believe, of the investors complained that they did not have enough time to consider the matter. We then got a disparate group of responses. Five investors said they supported the Scheme; one said that they were going to vote against it ; two of them said that they had complaints against Leigh Day, which we sent on to them; three had complaints about the FCA; seven had comments on the Explan; nine had comments on the voting form; and four had complaints about various other people, I think. So, that is what has happened since.

    Just before we deal with what we do next, I think it is important to start by saying what is the

[^1]:    from saying whatever they want to say about that in due course, but that is not really a matter for now.

    Then we have the question of how we get the notification of all these various documents out and how the voting takes place and all those various issues. The first is the voting itself. We discussed with your Ladyship at the last hearing that this would happen by a sort of semi-hybrid meeting. We have amended both the convening order and the Explanatory Statement, and the voting form to give the opportunity for people to say, "I cannot deal with this by the internet or by telephone. I can only deal with it by turning up." Then that will be considered and then whoever needs a room, we can provide a room in London, should that be necessary. So, that is hybrid, and I believe that is agreed, and I know that the Investor Advocate also supports that.

    Then, we have the question of notification. So, how do we get these documents out there? As I explored with your Ladyship at the last hearing, we do not have details of most of the underlying investors. We are not entitled to get details of the underlying investors from the platforms, and it would be dealing with the underlying investors in a

