

Subject: Margaret

Date: Thursday, June 29, 2006 22:43

From: Ian Sheppard <ianrsheppard@yahoo.co.uk>

To: "McDonald, Kirsty" <Kirsty.McDonald@BAKERNET.com>

Cc: Henry Frydensen <henry.frydenson@bakernet.com>

Conversation: Margaret

~~758~~
740

Dear Kirsty,

My brother Richard is happy to go halves with me, which makes the costs more tolerable! We can at least forge ahead and try to negotiate a settlement with your advice, rather than going it alone.

Also, I phoned Margaret - as she had not replied to any of my e-mails and judging by her conversation with Rita, was getting herself very wound up. I explained our position very clearly - in particular that we thought Inkpen could be transferred to Richard and I, and that we would pay CAT an amount that we felt morally obliged to pay. She did not seem to realise that CAT may also have a basis for a legal claim, but I guess they have not seen the will (can they get a copy from the Probate Office?)

She agreed to meet with me when I get back from South Africa so we can talk more - it was a civilised conversation, quite friendly at the end really. However she refused to allow me to meet CAT with her on the 10th - suggesting that I should meet with CAT separately if I wanted to.

She has very one-sided views and was assuming that Richard and I were out of the picture thanks to the legacies we already received. One thing we agreed on is that we both find it difficult to let Inkpen go.

She said that there is another will from 2002 and that it left even less money to Richard and I, and is signed at the end. That's just what she says though - she is obviously worried about something. He wrote a new will after marrying Margaret and the last one just before he died.

THREAT AGAIN

but his then knew instead
mayd had legal advce

RE LIE

She had not realised that the second part of the 2004 will could be invalid though, had she reverted to it. I'm not sure if a will is partially invalid, but those things are covered in a previous will, whether that kicks in or if there can only be one valid will (so that the rest passes under intestacy rules). Could you clarify this point for me please?

My wife Nicola remembers that we bumped into Rita in Weybridge in 1999, and Rita said she had a copy of a will that she had witnessed, that was the one leaving Inkpen to Richard and I.

Margaret is not going to do anything with Inkpen until at least the end of the year. She said that if we want Inkpen we'll have to pay the market price to CAT. However, when I challenged her as to whether she would pay the market price if she decided to keep it, she avoided the issue!

At least she understands our position now if not all the legal aspects, and I understand her viewpoint. I think now may be a good time to send that letter, if you and Henry are agreeable. That will give us a basis to start negotiating when I get back. Hopefully she will appoint a legal representative and get proper advice.

I also told her that being separated from my wife Nicola will make it very unlikely that Nicola could have any claim on it in a divorce, if I gained a share in the property. I said that Nicola had been a major factor in Dad's thinking, and in particular that I felt bad that could have caused Richard to lose his share in Inkpen (as well as me).

Kind regards,

Ian

Ian Sheppard
Tel 07759 455770

~~739~~
741

