

Exposing the Truth

At the end of 2024 Ian Sheppard cleared out an old filing cabinet full of papers relating to the litigation over his father Graham's wills. The litigation took place between 2006 and 2009. Ian's three main conclusions were:

1. Examining all the correspondence it is very obvious that there was a cover-up by Margaret Sheppard (nee Barling) and Chris Barling, starting with their meeting with solicitor Richard Walford in Exeter.
2. Ian was wrongly demonised by his stepmother Margaret having made perfectly reasonable suggestions as to how he and his brother Richard could share their former family home with the Centre for Alternative Technology (CAT), the environmental charity in Wales that was left the property in Graham's will.
3. Any impartial Judge would have seen the truth. Unfortunately, the Judge was not impartial.

The family home was called Hunters Way, and it was in a village called Inkpen – the family often referred to it simply as 'Inkpen'. It was the main property in Graham's estate; their other properties were in Margaret's name.

Ian's suggestions followed his realisation that his father had no valid will, and thus died intestate.

Instead of communicating to him that his idea might not work due to the large amount of inheritance tax that would be payable (among other things), Margaret and her brother Chris Barling (who under the will would have been executors) sought the advice of a solicitor who took an unfortunate and illegal decision.

Instead of receiving something to sign to put the 2005 will through Probate, their strategy with the lawyer, Richard Walford of Gilbert Stephens in Exeter, was to push a fabricated story supported by fake evidence. They *thought* this would see Ian off.

With Graham's will of 2nd August 2005 already known to be invalid – as Margaret had taken the will to her parents to sign when Graham was unconscious in hospital – their fabricated story was designed to support the notion that the will of 12th October 2004 was valid.

In the days after Graham died (following 24th August 2005) Margaret told Ian and Richard that Graham's Last Will was invalid but that there was a will in 2002 which left them far less. She alluded to another will from 2004 but just mumbled something about it. Later Margaret clearly realised that the 2002 will was not valid as it pre-dated their marriage in April 2004.

By the time Ian received the fake evidence relating to the will of 12th October 2004 he had already established that it could not be valid. But Margaret and her brother Chris Barling, via her solicitor, presenting a fake case; naturally Ian was infuriated that they (the executors) would lie in this way, Ian was still grieving for his father.

The Truth Should Have Been the Starting Point

Ian's position was always that the truth was the starting point, but Margaret told everyone that he was trying to 'knock down' Graham's will. This was not the case, Ian simply wanted them to tell the truth and discuss the options. They never would.

So what happened on 12th October 2004? Ian saw his father at his Uncle Norrie's in the afternoon and Graham said that he had come via Inkpen, where he had hired a sit-on

tractor-mower to cut the increasingly long grass ahead of a weather front that could leave it too wet for quite a while.

Ultimately Ian, without a diary to rely on, reconstructed his movements and memories completely for that day. For example, Graham said he had been to the Harry Edwards Sanctuary in Shere with Norrie that morning. He said that Margaret was on her way up the A303. He said he and Margaret were flying to Rome the following day from Heathrow, and Ian offered them a lift. He left before Margaret arrived.

Blocked at every turn when trying to obtain evidence, Ian did manage to obtain the mower records from A4 Hire in Hungerford. The date of hire, 11/10/2004 had been altered to 10/11/2004 by the owner of A4 Hire, Paul Folland.

However, Graham's bank statement showed that this latter date coincided with a trip Graham and Margaret made to Dublin. A fake invoice followed, sent from Margaret's fax number. This to add to her fake diary entries and lying witness statements.

Margaret Sheppard relied heavily on a witness statement from a family friend called Margaret Bacon. When Margaret (Sheppard) first mentioned this lady, she e-mailed Ian saying they her parents had a friend at their house who remembered them saying that Graham and Margaret would be coming for the purpose of them witnessing his will.

The wording was such that any reasonable person could see that Margaret Bacon had left before Margaret Sheppard, on her own, arrived. Margaret Bacon clearly hadn't known about the change of plan – Graham heading to Inkpen on the train to cut the grass. Graham had left without Margaret as she had to wait, as their BA tickets to Rome had not arrived in the post that day as expected.

Ian and his then wife Nicola remembered Graham telling them this the following week when Graham returned from Rome before Margaret, who stayed with her friend Luisa. Graham had also said that Margaret left Nicola's birthday card on the kitchen table in Teignmouth before she left (on 12th).

Forward-wind to the trial, in 2008, and Ian lost. He was perplexed, as Margaret's case was clearly fabricated. That night Ian looked up the judge, Sir Nicholas Warren, and realised that he was a very close contemporary of Margaret's distant relative and acquaintance Sir Gerald Barling. Margaret had told Ian on two or three occasions about researching her family tree and that she had befriended a senior QC/judge and even mentioned they had found a link to Uncle Norrie in his family tree. This can be found online and is indeed intriguing. Graham's sister, Ian's Aunty Carol, also mentioned in letter to him that there were forces he "couldn't imagine" helping Margaret.

The judge deliberately ignored the mower records and this was the main reason Ian was suspicious.

Even when trying to get leave to appeal from the Court of Appeal, and failing, Ian later realised that they had likely selected the lead judge whose only comment was that Sir Nicholas Warren had been entitled to rely on the witness statement of Margaret Bacon. This was ridiculous given what Margaret had originally stated about Ms. Bacon's recollection. Clearly, they wanted her to be there - so they placed her there, just like they placed Graham in the car with Margaret going up the A303 when he had in fact left Teignmouth the day before to go to Inkpen.

Unfortunately for Margaret, she put in her falsified diary on 12th October 2004 that she "nodded off" while Graham drove – medical records are clear, Graham was experiencing double vision at the time and both Ian and Nicola recall that Margaret did not trust Graham drive at the time. Naturally.

This case illustrated that, unfortunately for the unwary, lawyers run rings around the system and have ways of working that, in effect, ignore their codes of conduct. And the law, in fact.

UNDUE INFLUENCE

This is the topic Ian has previously not wanted to mention but it should be said. Despite what most in the family think, Margaret had deep selfish motives. She met a man with very good prospects and ended up very wealthy but Ian believes there is a case for saying that Margaret had worked on Graham for years to ensure the house at Inkpen wasn't left to Ian and Richard, as Graham had promised to their mother Helen when they got divorced and he decided to buy her out. Margaret ended up with their other houses - yet also ended up persuading Graham to leave the Inkpen house to her 'As long as she wanted it' - though she later said she regretted agreeing to that. That was going too far given that she had already 'green lighted' him leaving it to the Centre for Alternative Technology. However, consider this: It was clear to Ian that Graham had dragged his feet on completing a will. He did it in 2004, and then 2005. It was always a last-minute thing so Ian's proposition of truth is that Graham's heart wasn't really in leaving Hunters Way to CAT. In his heart, he'd always intended to leave it to Ian and Richard. It was their to refuse, if you like. But when it came to the intestacy, this was too much for Margaret to admit and she decided to cover up the truth rather than admit it to Ian and Richard. Underlying this assertion is the fact that Graham in his last couple of years of life wanted to spend lots of time at Hunters Way *on his own*, much to Margaret's chagrin. Thus it wasn't unusual when he decided to get the train there on 11th October 2004 - while Margaret scrambled around later to place him with her then and on 12th, when he had cut the grass at Inkpen and gone up to Uncle Norrie's house in Hersham on the train, and had not remained behind in Teignmouth to drive up the A303 with Margaret the next morning. She was alone with his will, duly signed by her parents with him not there. The fact now support this heavily and that an independent judge was not on hand to assess this in November 2008 means justice had not been done, and the truth has not been admitted by them yet. Despite their failure to get the swapped date on the mower records to hold water - their argument that the mowing took place in November 2004 rather than 11/10/2004, as someone had clearly altered the records to 10/11/2004, completely fell apart with the revelation that they were in Dublin that week and that the code on the mower records meant it had to be 10/11/2004 that it was hired or not at all - despite the fake A4 Hire invoice that followed from Margaret's fax machine. There is only one conclusion - that Ian's account and recollection is the correct one. It also fits in perfectly with all his other memories of what happened on 12th October 2004, backed up by Nicola Sheppard with her excellent memory.

SYNOPSIS

When retired airline pilot Graham Sheppard sadly died in August 2005 aged 62, after a 5-year terminal illness, he'd completed a handwritten will a few weeks earlier but it wasn't signed by witnesses until the night before he died, when he was in hospital unconscious. The 'witnesses' were the parents of Margaret Sheppard (nee Barling), who Graham had married in April 2004. After his death, Margaret told Graham's sons

Ian and Richard that Graham's Last Will was invalid, mumbled about another will in 2004 but asserted that one in 2002 was definitely valid, and left Ian and Richard "far less". Later Margaret realised that Graham's 2002 will was not valid, due to being completed before their marriage, and started to say that the 2004 will was valid. She, and her brother Chris Barling, claimed Graham had gone with her to see her parents in Teignmouth and have the will witnessed on 12th October 2004, but Ian had established that Graham went to their former family home at Inkpen, Berks on 11th October 2004 and hired a tractor-mower to cut the field. Margaret had stayed behind to wait for their BA tickets for Rome that were late, then they met up again in Hersham late on 12th to stay the night with Ian's Uncle Norrie before flying out to Rome the next day. Ian recalls clearly meeting with Graham on 12th October 2004 and discussing the mowing, among other things, including that Margaret was on her way up the A303 in their car. Ian was later able to obtain mower records from the hire shop, A4 Hire in Hungerford, but found that the date on the hire had been changed from 11/10/2004 to 10/11/2004. Then he discovered that Margaret and Graham were in Dublin on another short break on 10/11/2004 and that the hire, due to the code in the Hiremate IT system, could not have been for another date, as Margaret and the hire shop owner Paul Folland claimed (they said it was hired over the weekend before). Litigation went on for over two years and ended up in the High Court in London in 2008. After the trial, which Ian lost unexpectedly, he realised that the judge in the case, Sir Nicholas Warren QC, was a close contemporary of Margaret's relative Sir Gerald Barling QC, also a High court judge. Although a distant relative, Margaret had befriended Sir Gerald when researching the Barling family tree. She told Ian about this on a couple of occasions but it is feasible that Margaret had forgotten this and had wrongly assured Sir Gerald that Ian could not be aware of any connection. Ian left all the material from 3 years of litigation (2006-9) in an old filing cabinet and when he cleared it out in 2024, he scanned in much of the material and included it in the account of the case which is presented here:

COVER-UP OF INTESTACY

The aim of the following is to highlight how corrupt the legal world can be and how lies and fixing a judge led to injustice that the legal world just doesn't want to know about. Once a case is finished, lawyers and judges are untouchable and in UK civil litigation there is almost no mechanism for proper review, which weakens access to justice for ordinary people and leaves them wondering how lawyers are allowed to regulate themselves, and brush things under the carpet to protect their contemporaries. This illustrates that in the UK, major reform of litigation and the checks and balances on lawyers is well overdue.

In summary, Ian Sheppard's father Graham died in 2005 and had written a will on 2 August 2005 and an earlier one on 12 October 2004, and one in 2002. The 2002 will was invalid as Graham had later that year married Margaret Barling. Margaret admitted to Ian and his brother that Graham's last will was invalid but warned him that the will of 2004 was valid and left him £80,000 less. Later Ian discovered this had been a lie and that will was invalid also. However, with the support of lawyer Richard Walford and her brother Chris Barling, Margaret created a false story and evidence to cover this up. Then, when Ian had proved that this was the case, Margaret and her lawyers managed to fix the trial. Ian only found out after the trial that the judge, who ignored Ian's strong evidence, was a

very close contemporary of a Gerald Barling, a relative of Margaret's who had been helping her to research their family tree.

Ian was very close to his father and discussed his wills with him on a couple of occasions, in particular when he was updating it in 2005 due to changes of circumstances, but Margaret was always there looking over his shoulder. Ian had young children so understood why Graham would not want him to have the burden of being an executor, to some extent, and he had put Margaret and her brother Chris down instead. Ian was suspicious of their motives, however, in particular towards their former family home where Ian grew up (in Inkpen, Berkshire).

What Ian took, and still takes, exception to was not the will but the lying; if they'd only told the truth Ian would have been open to agreeing to put the last will through to Probate, but the fact they forced the 2004 will on him (after eventually admitting properly that the 2005 one was invalid) supported by lies and fabricated evidence is controlling, undemocratic and downright illegal. Versus Ian's first-hand knowledge that Graham was not at Margaret parents' house when the will was 'witnessed'.

This is the story, including all relevant documents, of how them placing Graham with Margaret on 11-12th October 2004 meant the judge (who they fixed anyway) called Ian a liar. However it still does not explain how probate was granted on the will of 2005, the last will, which even the corrupt judge had to rule as invalid. How can that stay in place without Ian's express, written consent as one of the main beneficiaries? At the outset, he would have almost certainly given this consent, but his position now is that ultimately Graham died intestate and Margaret and Chris Barling had no right to act as executors without Ian's agreement.

COVER-UP: THE TIMELINE

1999: Airline pilot Graham Sheppard (57) was diagnosed with Myelofibrosis (a terminal illness) having failed a flying medical for Heathrow-based cargo operator AFX, which was operating Boeing 747s. [Graham had had a long career in flying](#), and was divorced from Helen, the mother of their sons Ian ([born 1969](#)) and [Richard](#) (born 1970), in the 1980s. In the late 1980s he met Margaret Barling, a languages teacher at Brooklands College in Weybridge. Margaret retired in the 1990s.

2002: Graham completed the [first of three handwritten wills](#). Note that under [s9 of the Wills Act 1837](#) a will to be valid has to have been signed in the presence of two witnesses.

April 2004: [Graham marries Margaret](#) Barling, in part so she could benefit from his BA pension, and transfer assets, having said he would never marry again. This marriage renders the 2002 will invalid automatically, although Margaret seems to have forgotten this at the time Graham died (in August 2005) as she suggested Ian and Richard would "get even less" under that earlier will.

KEY DATE: 12th OCTOBER 2004

12th October 2004: Date on Graham's [second will](#). However, on 11th October Graham had in fact gone up to [Hunters Way](#), the house in Inkpen, near Hungerford (Berkshire), where his sons Ian and Richard had grown up. Graham still owned the property and he wanted to go to cut the grass which had got very long and he was in a race with a weather front that was due to come up from France that night (see [weather](#)).

He thus went up by [train from Teignmouth](#) and hired a sit-on tractor-mower at A4 Hire in Hungerford (they would have dropped him off in Inkpen with the tractor-mower). [Aston Piper](#), a family friend who usually cut the grass, was on a long trip to Zambia and was not due to return to the UK until 4th November. Graham was also due to meet with local builder Mike Kersey (who was to prove very elusive).

Then on 12th October Graham [took a train](#) to Hersham (near Walton-on-Thames, SW London) where he was to meet Margaret at the home his uncle Edward Norrington ('Norrie', who sadly died in 2006). That morning Margaret took the so far 'unwitnessed' will to her parents' house in Teignmouth, they signed it, and she set off driving up the A303. She had panicked at the prospect of Graham, who was quite vulnerable, flying and therefore wanted his will to be 'executed'. At this point she probably was aware that he had no valid will but that is not certain due to comments she made just after Graham died, in August 2005 – she seemed to think the pre-marriage 2002 will was safe to fall back on.

As she and Graham were going to Rome on 13th October, Margaret had been concerned Graham needed to complete his will and so brought it with her in the car. The reason she stayed behind in Teignmouth on 11th was that their [BA tickets](#) to Rome had not yet arrived in the post. Their car, a Ford Mondeo (registration L295 MMV), was in the garage for its [MOT](#). Ian recalls his father mentioning, when they met on Tuesday 12th October, that Margaret had picked the car up from the garage. Graham paid the garage on the morning of 11th October then left the car there having the work it needed to pass the MOT (wheel bearing etc). Margaret picked it up later on the morning of 12th October. Graham [went to get the train](#) on the morning of the 11th so he, at least, could stick to their original plan of going to Inkpen. It was Margaret who drove up the A303 on 12th October, on her own, having called Dr. Roberts (there are two calls in their phone records to Dr. Roberts - Graham first thing and Margaret later before she left to go to her parents with Graham's will. The supposed Diary only records the first call, strangely!)

NICOLA SHEPPARD'S BIRTHDAY CARD RECOLLECTION

The recollection by Nicola and Ian (see 23rd September) that Graham told them their BA tickets to Rome had not arrived is shown in this e-mail chain between Margaret and her friend [Luisa](#) in Rome, who they would be visiting. Margaret tried to use this as evidence Graham was still with her later in the day – which simply wasn't the case.

On 12th October 2004, or even 11th most of the day, Graham was not in Teignmouth. Margaret had stayed to wait for the tickets while he went to Inkpen on the train, as Margaret was due to pick up their car on 12th before coming up to meet Graham in [Hersham](#), to stay the night with Norrie before flying to Rome from Heathrow. Their phone records show a call to the MOT Garage at around 10am on 11th October; Ian

believes that Graham then walked down to pay for the MOT and the work that was required for it to pass, before catching the train from the station nearby.

Ian knew they were to come up separately as he spoke to Margaret on the phone in the days before they flew to Rome, when Margaret expressed concern at Graham flying. When Ian spoke to Graham before he set off for Norrie's on the 12th, Graham seemed agitated and not that keen for him to come. During that meeting, that afternoon, Ian was shocked at Graham's appearance, swollen liver etc.

Ian was aware that Margaret was [driving up the A303](#) with the undated will (Graham alluded to being agitated about her insisting he do it before [flying due to his health](#), and Margaret alluded to the will also in her phone call with him, which may well be the one shown in their [home phone records](#) for 6, Benedict Close, Teignmouth) – and that Graham had hired a tractor-mower at Inkpen, because the immediate thought was the danger of doing that when in poor health (but Graham prided himself on being 'hardy!').

Note: As can be seen on the 2004 will, the writing of the date and address is different. In fact, the reason Ian went to see Graham at Norrie's, even though Graham tried to dissuade him, was because the concerns Margaret had raised about his fitness for flying.

When at Uncle Norrie's in Hersham, Ian was told by Graham that he and Norrie had just been to the [Harry Edwards Sanctuary](#) in Shere, Surrey, where Graham liked to go sometimes for treatment, or just to medicate in the tranquil grounds. Graham likely saw Dawn Redwood, a healer (who has always refused to communicate with Ian). According to the Sanctuary, there were no records although Dawn Redwood has always been elusive. Ian has a feeling that Graham said he wanted Norrie to see Dawn, and get some healing. The Sanctuary did keep a [database](#) but the Sanctuary denied having any records for Graham Sheppard - which is highly implausible. As ever, data protection makes obtaining information extremely difficult, you often need a Court Order and even that is difficult and expensive to obtain, and the other side was clearly vetoing the release of any useful information - combined with their incomplete disclosure, it made things a massive struggle. However the tractor-mower hire records ultimately blew a hold in the defendant's case... or should have.

TRACTOR-MOWER AT INKPEN

Ian was concerned doing the mowing had not been a good idea for Graham in his state of health – he mentioned this to his friend/fellow students [Julie Rowe](#) (now a qualified solicitor and STEP practitioner but who ultimately was [unable to attend Court](#)) and [Mark Smith](#) at law classes that evening at Kingston University, and to his grandmother, who he [called](#) shortly before going into the lecture. Ian recounted recalling this much later in an [e-mail](#) to his lawyer at the time, John Devlin.

Ian had also offered Graham (who would be flying to Rome with Margaret) a lift to Heathrow the next day as he was going to [Terminal 5](#) to see the construction progress. Graham accepted but that evening phoned Nicola to decline the lift, as they planned to get a taxi.

17th October 2004: Graham (without Margaret) called in to see Ian and Nicola at Worcester Park, where they lived. He apologised for not bringing Nicola's birthday card (her birthday was 18th October). He said Margaret had left it at their home in Teignmouth before she had driven up to meet him at Uncle Norrie's in Hersham before the Rome trip.

7th March 2005: E-mail from Ian Sheppard to Nicola Sheppard (his wife) reflecting on losing his job the year before and going freelance, money issues with having three children, and that the generous [£100,000 gifted to Ian](#) (with the same to his brother Richard) by Graham in 2003 had mostly been used to pay off debts (Nicola had been without work since 1996 and had been dedicated to bringing up their children).

20th July 2005: Ian broke up with his wife Nicola and moved out of their home in Worcester Park. Ian moved to Wimbledon and later to Hascombe, Surrey, where he carried on with legal studies at the College of Law in Guildford (Legal Practice Certificate, or LPC, gained in mid-2007).

2nd August 2005: Date on [Last Will](#) which was invalid as Graham had signed the will but it was signed by Margaret's parents, Ruth and Tom Barling, in Teignmouth on the evening of 23rd August, the night before Graham died. Graham was unconscious on morphine in hospital in Torbay after suffering a ruptured liver while driving. Much later, Margaret and her solicitor were to delay a long time the admission that this will was invalid (in fact it was inadvertent by her Barrister at a preliminary hearing... after they had applied for Grant of Probate on the 2005 will).

12th August 2005: Ian met Graham and Margaret at Inkpen (Hunters Way) and discussed his breaking up with Nicola. Ian had a private conversation with his father. Graham said he had been writing a new will because the 2004 one was invalid (at that time Ian recalled the circumstances surrounding the Rome trip but didn't give it much thought); and the earlier one (from 2002) was too due to his marriage to Margaret in April 2004.

Graham said Ian will be left his money in trust due to split with Nicola and said he is intending to leave more money to Ian "to help you get back on your feet". He showed Ian the 2005 will which Graham has already signed, before it was witnessed. Ian, who was studying law, thought this was strange given that once witnessed it would still be invalid, as the signing itself should be witnessed, in law. Note: It is clear that his 2004 will had been written by Graham in the same way, signing at the time of writing but in that case he didn't date it until signatures of 'witnesses' had been obtained.

GRAHAM DIES INTESTATE

24th August 2005: [Graham](#) died minutes before Ian arrived in Teignmouth at the hospital. Margaret had been slow to tell Ian that this could be the end. Richard was soon told and booked a flight back to the UK from Zambia. Ian went to pick him up and bring him to Teignmouth, where they stayed with Margaret.

26th August 2005: Margaret told Ian and [Richard](#) that Graham's will was technically invalid, but used the threat of an earlier will leaving less to them. Graham's estate represented 44% of their joint estate, according to Chris Barling during later negotiations. This was primarily Hunters Way, cash in his bank/savings accounts, and some personal possessions such as his collection of musical instruments.

30th March 2006: [Probate](#) was granted on Graham's will of 2nd August 2005 though Ian is not sure when he was told about this. It took until well into May for Margaret to pay beneficiaries; she and Chris had been acting very strangely, and Ian was cut out of any conversations about managing the estate.

29th June 2006: [E-mail](#) from Ian to his solicitors regarding Margaret again saying the 2002 will was valid and left Ian and Richard less.

10th July 2006: [E-mail](#) from Margaret to Ian where she says: "The so-called truth is actually rather relative."

15th July 2006: [E-mail from Richard to Ian](#) reflecting on Margaret.

22nd August 2006: Ian writes to his brother Richard reflecting on [possible settlement](#).

22nd September 2006: Margaret's brother Chris Barling called Ian and offered to settle for £40,000. Ian refused but e-mailed him and Margaret with an alternative suggestion. Given that Ian suspected that his father had died intestate, he knew that this was a problem. He said that the property at Hunters Way could still be used by the Centre for Alternative Technology (the 2nd Defendant), who would benefit from the property if the last will had been valid (and did in fact in the end receive the proceeds of the property). Ian [e-mails Chris Barling](#) straight after the phone conversation.

23rd September 2006: Ian mentioned the date on Graham's second will (12th October 2004) to his estranged wife Nicola during a dinner with their children, Tristan, Frederic & Sebastian (Graham's grandchildren). Nicola, who has an excellent memory, recalled Graham calling in at Ian & Nicola's house in Worcester Park, Surrey after returning from Rome (Graham had flown back alone from Rome, [Margaret staying until 22nd](#) with her friend Luisa). The day Graham called in was 17th October, the day before Nicola's 31st birthday. Nicola recalled, and Ian remembered too, that Graham apologised for not having her birthday card with him – and blamed Margaret for leaving it in Teignmouth before she left.

This was a very significant moment, as Ian realised immediately that Margaret had lied about the validity of Graham's 12th October 2004 will.

Immediately after this Ian started to reconstruct events surrounding that date, on an [October 2004 Calendar](#). A little later he reconstructed a Diary page for 12th October 2004 to help him try to recall more – he eventually recalled a lot of detail about the day. Note [this Diary](#) was kept by Ian after a motorcycle crash on 10th March 2004 but unfortunately the last entry was 9th September 2004.

Neither the Calendar nor the Diary page were intended to be evidence in any possible future trial (though they were disclosed to the other side pre-trial). At this point Ian thought the main aim would be to get an amicable agreement with Margaret and Chris (Barling). Ian made it clear to them that he believed his father died intestate. But from this point on he wanted above all else for them to admit the truth, as a starting point.

25th September 2006: Ian wrote to his solicitor Stan Baring explaining he had [started to reconstruct what had happened in mid-October 2004](#) based on the recollection about Nicola's birthday card.

2nd October 2006: Ian e-mail to Margaret (Sheppard nee Barling) and Chris (Barling) discussing [options given Graham had died intestate](#).

2nd October 2006: E-mail from Ian to his brother Richard [predicting that Margaret would now make up a story](#) to try to stand up the earlier (2004) will.

MARGARET GETS A SOLICITOR: FROM SILENCE TO LIES

3rd October 2006: First communication received from solicitors [Gilbert Stephens](#) (Richard Walford).

4th October 2006: [E-mail from Margaret](#) to Ian. Change of tone – due to solicitor?

10th October 2006: [e-mail to Ian from Tim Good](#), Graham's best friend, saying Graham "returned to Inkpen by himself" after the Rome trip – this presumably was after seeing Ian and Nicola at Worcester Park on 17th October 2004 (in fact Graham flew out to Rome on 13th and back alone on 17th, lunchtime). Graham had an appointment in Torbay, Devon with Patrick Roberts, his consultant, on 20th October 2004, so probably did route back via Inkpen again.

10th October 2006: [E-mail from Margaret](#) to Ian, copying in Richard. Margaret: "There was a friend there who recalls by father saying that we would be coming for that purpose," referring to Margaret Bacon (this suggests she in fact left before Margaret arrived to have her parents sign the will).

13th December 2006: [E-mail from Ian to Stan Baring](#), his first solicitor, reflecting on the long delays in Margaret filling in any details of her movements around 12th October 2004.

13th December 2006: Ian e-mails Margaret saying that she still [hasn't filled in her story](#) between the supposed will signing of 12th October 2004 and her going to Rome with Graham on 13th October. It was to take until March to receive their concocted story, attempting to place Graham with Margaret.

29th January 2007: Gilbert Stephens Solicitors submits [IHT200 Form](#) for Graham Sheppard's estate to the Inland Revenue.

5th February 2007: Ian Sheppard wrote an [e-mail](#) to the solicitors for the Centre for Advanced Technology (CAT), supposed beneficiary, and ultimately listed as Margaret's codefendants though they took mainly an observer role in the proceedings.

8th February 2007: [Ian wrote to Roger Davies](#), who was one of Graham's best friends since his school days, recounting how Margaret had launched into saying Graham was with her on 12th October 2004 - something Ian already knew to be impossible.

21st February 2007: Margaret takes 'affidavits of due execution' ([Tom Barling](#) and Ruth Barling) relating to the 2004 will to Gwen Grimshaw, commissioner for oaths, at Scott Richards Solicitors in Teignmouth. See [letter](#). Later Grimshaw and Margaret's solicitor Richard [Walford](#) both deny that Margaret's parents were not present. Ian later [wrote](#) to Richard Walford about Gwen Grimshaw's not administering this correctly – it showed again that Margaret was still in the habit of getting paperwork witnessed by her parents herself – without them present!

23rd February 2007: Margaret comes up with a story regarding what she and Graham did on 12th October 2004 but it conflicts what Ian remembers. [He recounts this in an e-mail](#) to his brother Richard.

24th February 2007: Ian recounted in an e-mail to his brother that [Margaret had boasted at how rich she was](#) on her general behaviour after Graham died.

4th March 2007: Ian wrote to his solicitor John Devlin discussing saying that Margaret had said how she had rushed Graham's 2005 will up to her parents on the night before he died, before later [saying the 2002 will was "definitely valid"](#), something Richard recalled clearly too. Of course, this was not the case due to her marriage to Graham but she did not know that at the time.

2007: [Deed of Agreement](#) with Centre for Alternative Technology under which Hunters Way would go to CAT under either the 2005 or the 2004 will. At this point Margaret and her lawyers still had not admitted that the 2005 will was invalid, let alone the 2004 one.

7th March 2007: Ian wrote another [e-mail to CAT](#) reflecting on Margaret's offer. Also on this date, Ian wrote to solicitor about their offer to settle but also that [Margaret seemed intent on keeping Inkpen](#), which didn't sit well with Ian especially as he thought his father died intestate anyway.

THE FAKE DIARY PAGES

13th March 2007: Ian's solicitor received a letter from Richard Walford with a supposed copy of Margaret's [diary](#) from the week of 12th October 2004 purporting to show that Graham was in Teignmouth on 12th October 2004 for the signing of the will. Ian is shocked by these blatant lies.

John Devlin, his lawyer, sends Ian an e-mail reflecting on the [implications for his case](#). [Note the nature of these revelations – an ambush before a hearing!]

In hindsight, their evidence was very weak – Margaret’s lying witness statement with pages from her fabricated diary, her parents affidavits that were meaningless given their history of not doing what they said they’d done (!) and also [Margaret Bacon’s witness statement](#), also completely without credibility for reasons made obvious in other parts of this timeline.

The Diary (for Transcript see below) lacks much credibility as evidence as it is self-made by Margaret, and is either completely redone or doctored to add in ‘with G’... and there is no way Margaret would have ‘dozed off’ for half an hour while Graham drove as he was getting double vision sometimes and wasn’t safe – this is in his medical records and Ian remembers it being a major concern in 2004/5.

Early morning on 15th March 2007: Ian recounts his increasingly comprehensive recollection of his meeting with his father on 12th October 2004 at Uncle Norrie’s and professes to ["not being afraid" of the 2004 will](#) any more for this reason, as it could not be valid. At this point Ian knew he’d visited his father at Norrie’s but couldn’t remember how Graham had travelled - train or car. His first instinct had been train but then he thought they had 2 cars so it made little sense, before he remembered about his father’s double vision and how dangerous it was for him to drive far and then eventually got confirmation they’d sold their Ford Fusion around that time, so only had the Ford Mondeo Ian had given them a few years earlier. It was not due to lack of memories it was a case of where various memories belonged in time, and gradually with work Ian was able to establish what was the correct chain of events.

15th March 2007: [Preliminary Hearing](#) before Master Bowles at the Royal Courts of Justice in London. Margaret’s barrister Robert Sheridan inadvertently reveals that the 2005 will was invalid. This is the [Claim Form](#) and [Order](#).

According to the [solicitor’s Attendance Note](#), at the hearing on 15th March before Master Bowles: "RS said an attempt to revoke the 2005 will would not be opposed. The defendant obtained the signature of her late husband then took the will to her parents. She was not aware of the provisions of the Wills Act." Of course Graham was unconscious in hospital and in fact had signed the will at the time of writing, but the admission astonished everyone at the hearing. The Note records further: "Master Bowles responded by saying that he took it that she [Margaret Sheppard] had no understanding about the testamentary requirements in relation to the 2004 will either."

Later that day Ian [e-mailed Richard Sheppard](#) about the hearing.

29th March 2007: [Ian recounts to John Devlin](#) how he has further pieced together the sequence of events from 12th October 2004, based on his various memories of the day.

Ian had by this time pieced together, from various memories, the events surrounding 12th October 2004, including recalling that the visit to Harry Edwards’ Sanctuary his father had mentioned during their meeting had been on the morning of 12th October, not the day before.

At this point he was also trying to recollect the dates of his father's trip to Rome and at one point was told by BA that Graham had travelled out alone! But in fact he had travelled out with Margaret and back alone, before her. Anything like this, Richard Walford pounced on to exploit it but it was simply Ian trying to piece his memories back together into a coherent string of events – made harder by [Margaret](#) not helping.

Ian pieced his own movements back together initially; and then focused more on those of Graham and then Margaret, and this served as a stimulus for further details being recalled, all fitting around the birthday card recollection.

It only really came together properly when Ian realised exactly the occasion/day in question, without having a diary and very little else to go on initially for something that happened well over a year beforehand. For example, he had made more than one visit to Norrie's over the years – one time he met with only Norrie, while another time both Graham and Margaret were there, but the occasion when Graham was on his own, with Margaret due to arrive later, was distinct and ultimately it all made sense combined with other genuine memories – including the mowing (discussed below).

A4 HIRE AND AMENDED MOWER RECORDS

Although this was all but ignored by the judge, it was of central importance – Ian only asked A4 Hire for the mower records after remembering his visit to Norrie's to see his father, recalling his father discussed that he'd mowed the grass at Inkpen. At no point did Margaret or anyone else mention this possibility to Ian, yet it yielded records that did (if they had not been tampered with) show his father did hire the tractor-mower that day, and Ian even recalls being aware that he'd wanted to do it then as rain was coming in overnight.

3rd April 2007: [Letter](#) from Ian's then lawyer John Devlin, to Richard Walford/Gilbert Stephens, reflecting on the implications from their surprise admission that the 2005 will was invalid. This came after Margaret had earlier that year signed a [Witness Statement of Testamentary Documents](#) to say both the 2004 and 2005 wills were valid. Document witnessed by Richard Walford but left undated.

17th April 2007: [Ian writes to Aston Piper](#), family friend who lives in Kintbury and used to cut the grass at Inkpen, reflecting on Graham not really being bothered about wills but also that he (Ian) had started looking into his father's wills when Margaret said she wanted to pay off the Centre for Alternative Technology and keep the Hunters Way property herself.

30 April 2007: Ian [writes](#) to Gilbert Stephens reflecting on the incredibly slow progress in getting documents.

18th May 2007: Ian [Witness Statement](#) relating to Graham's known wills.

30th May 2007: [Witness Statement](#) of Margaret Sheppard relating to the validity of the 2005 and 2004 wills.

31st May 2007: [Letter](#) from Ian Sheppard to Gilbert Stephens Solicitors regarding Nicola Sheppard's recollection of events.

3rd June 2007: [Witness Statement of Ian Sheppard](#).

5th June 2007: Ian [note to his solicitor](#) Stan Baring reflecting on Margaret's shock at his conviction regarding his recollection of going to Norrie's in Hersham to see Graham on the afternoon of 12th October 2004.

13th July 2007: Ian letter to [Margaret Bacon](#), who was supposedly at the Barlings' house when Graham and Margaret came for Graham to sign 2004 will and for it to be witnessed by Tom and Ruth Barling. From the original e-mail reference to Margaret Bacon, however, it is clear she only recalled that Graham and Margaret were supposed to be coming. Yet in the end it was only Margaret Sheppard that came but it was convenient to persuade Margaret Bacon later to do a witness statement saying she was there – all made up, of course, though it was admitted she couldn't attest to whether Graham had already signed the will beforehand, when he wrote it.

16th July 2007: [E-mail](#) from Ian to Stan Baring, Ian's then solicitor.

MARGARET: INTERFERING WITH WITNESSES

25th July 2007: [Margaret writes to Jean Kirke](#) demanding she [mark up a copy](#) of her witness statement with what she can recall! Here is the [second page](#) of the letter. Ian wrote an e-mail to his then solicitor Stan Baring reflecting that [Margaret's behaviour](#) had possibly lost him his grandmother as a witness. In the end she was in any case deemed [medically unfit](#) and Ian's mother, Helen, who lived nearby in the Isle of Man, did not want her involved after Margaret's tirade.

25th July 2007: Ian writes to [Mark Billingham](#), who was tiling the floor at Margaret and Graham's House in Benedict Close, Teignmouth on 11-12th October 2004 but he received no response. Mr. Billingham stayed for dinner on 11th with Margaret as he was also a friend, Graham having left. He had declined to be involved in the case (though he did have a [phone conversation](#) with Ian after the case concluded).

19th September 2007: E-mail from Ian to his solicitor Stan regarding Margaret's Diary and the fact she wouldn't have let Graham, who had been getting [double vision](#), drive while she "dozed off for half an hour", as recounted in the Diary pages disclosed.

2nd October 2007: Ian decided to act on a memory from his meeting with his father, a niggling memory that he might have mentioned hiring a sit on tractor-mower, and requests his father's account records from A4 Hire in Hungerford, near Inkpen. To his surprise he receives the [records from A4 Hire](#) (a [Denise Gaines](#)) showing Graham did in fact hire a tractor-mower. His original request came much earlier and he had called at A4 Hire in 14th February 2007 and Paul Folland said he would send Ian Graham's account, but he never did.

The records showed a date of 10/11/2004 for Graham's hiring of the tractor mower but Ian knew immediately that this was wrong and suspects Margaret, a friend of the owner of A4 hire (Paul Folland), had persuaded him to alter the records. He established with the IT company that wrote the Hiremate software that it had been possible on that version of the software, at the time, to alter a date.

Ian quickly established that the weather in November was in any case not suitable for Graham to use a tractor-mower, especially in his state of health, and in any case it was logical that it was far too late in the year; Graham wouldn't have been concerned at that point about grass growing – unlike in October when there was a spell of fine weather. In addition, family friend Aston Piper returned from Zambia on 4th November so he would have done any grass cutting after that, as usual.

15th February 2008: [Richard Sheppard](#) (Ian's younger brother) and other beneficiaries agree to renouncing their entitlements under Graham's last will. It is unlikely that the implications of this were explained to Richard, given that Margaret and her lawyer were proposing to replace it with the 2004 will. Ian refuses to do this, as he knows the 2004 will to be invalid and Margaret has still not admitted it.

31st March 2008: Ian wrote to Richard Walford, Margaret's solicitor, addressing the way [he'd tried to put words in Ian's mouth](#) about admitting the 2004 will was valid.

16th April 2008: [Ian wrote to Richard Walford](#) reflecting on Margaret's diary, which Ian knew must have been faked, and a cheque that had been marked on Graham Sheppard's [Lloyd's TSB account statement](#) as '000123' with no payee recorded. After a very long time Ian was sent [a scan purporting to show this cheque](#) but it seemed very suspicious and inconsistent, and the amount was about the same as a train ticket Teignmouth-Hungerford with Railcard discount. The train at that time should have been £25.75, so Ian has to assume his father paid cash though he still believes [Margaret did not do full and proper disclosure](#).

Ian was sent a [Transcript](#) of the fake diary pages. Ian believed Margaret got a blank 2004 diary and filled in these pages and was later forced to fill in the rest, suitably modified from the original to try to deal with the mower records. Note that Ian was at Norrie's on 12th October 2004 when Margaret phoned on her way up the A303 and asked Norrie to ask Graham to get a copy of *The Guinness Book of Records* in Weybridge (Ian remembers sitting with his father while Norrie, who was making tea, went to answer the phone in the room behind them).

That is also very likely when [Rita Blaine](#) bumped into Graham and later told Ian that Graham had looked terrible, and said he was going to meet Margaret. Ian had left for his lectures which started at 6.15 at Kingston University, via having dinner with his sons and Nicola at their home in Worcester Park. Nicola Sheppard remembers all this clearly.

17th April 2008: [Ian Sheppard Witness Statement](#).

25th April 2008: Ian writes to Denise Gaines of A4 Hire querying the [changes in what they were saying](#) about Graham hiring the tractor-mower in early November, rather than 11th October which Ian knew to be the case.

30th April 2008: Ian letter to [Master Behrens](#) complaining about without prejudice correspondence being disclosed by the other side.

19th June 2008: Ian letter to [Master Bowles](#) at the RCJ just before hearing on this date, regarding very late disclosure of documents by Margaret's solicitors.

1st July 2008: Ian goes to see Rita Blaine, Graham & Margaret's former neighbour when they lived at Old Railway Cottage, Weybridge.

8th July 2008: Ian [letter to Master Bowles](#) saying documents Margaret's solicitors had been referring to as affidavits of due execution were merely witnessed by Gwen Grimshaw without Tom and/or Ruth Barling present.

9th July 2008: Ian Sheppard's [Reply to Defence](#).

24th July 2008: Ian letter to Richard Walford expressing frustration over the [delay in getting to see Margaret's fake Diary](#), which Ian believes she is diligently creating around the original filling in of 11-12th October 2004. That it was a WH Smith cheap diary made Ian think Walford must keep diaries for clients to fake; Graham and Margaret supported several charities and never lacked charity diaries as the New Year approached.

23rd September 2008: E-mail from Ian to Richard Walford saying Margaret had tried to get her former neighbour in Weybridge, [Rita Blain](#), to lie for her but Rita had refused. Apparently other people were!

24th September 2008: [Ian wrote to the Court \(Master Bowles\)](#) regarding what he knows to be lies and fake evidence trying to prop up Margaret's story that Graham was with her on 12th October 2004.

1st October 2008: Ian [explains to Mark Billingham](#) how he disapproved of Margaret's behaviour, after Billingham unfortunately bowed to pressure to muddy the waters having said before he knew nothing that could help.

13th October 2008: Ian [e-mail](#) to Denise Gaines of A4 Hire after she told him on [10th October](#) that she would be on holiday from 3rd November. Ian initially sent an e-mail on [8th October](#). It was clear that Denise didn't want to go to Court or provide a witness statement, and neither did Paul Folland. Ian [wrote to Paul Folland](#) again on 28th October 2008 reflecting on inconsistencies in what A4 Hire told him at various times.

At one point Richard Walford wrote to Ian saying he had been aggressive towards A4 Hire but this was not true. Margaret had got them to provide a very blurred unreadable invoice, or created it herself, suggesting the mowing was on 6th November 2004

(See [weather](#)) not 11th October 2004, which was lovely weather but with a significant frontal weather system coming up from the south overnight.

3rd November 2008: Given doubts over Tom and Ruth Barling 'affidavits of due execution', Margaret & Chris's lawyers arrange a 'ceremony' as they claim he can't attend Court – even though Ian had seen him getting in and out of his car with no issues. Ian [recounted this to his](#) stepfather, John Lavender.

5th November 2008: Ian e-mail to Richard Walford recounting Rita Blain's opinion that [Margaret was "obsessed with wills"](#) and "wanted Inkpen [i.e. the Hunters Way property] "...more than anything."

DISCOVERING THEY CHOSE THEIR OWN JUDGE

3-7th November 2008: The case was finally heard at the High Court at the [Royal Courts of Justice](#) and Ian lost. The judge was [disparaging about him](#) (This is the Transcript of the final Trial). Ian was again shocked. He was also offended that the judge was disparaging about him being a professional journalist.

Judge Warren (Nicholas Warren QC) completely ignored the significance of the tractor-mower records, let alone the weather for mowing in November – Graham was paranoid about catching a virus as it [could have proved fatal](#).

In Court Ian was handed an almost impossible to read dot-matrix printout, faded copy of the purported [invoice](#) for tractor-mower hire by Margaret's barrister Giles Harrap (since deceased) – an invoice he had requested from A4 Hire many months before and never received, until it arrived from Margaret's solicitor before the trial and showed it had been sent from Margaret's fax machine in Teignmouth. No doubt more self-made evidence from Margaret, with the help of her friend Paul Folland of A4 Hire.

They had very late disclosed some booking pages (for [11th October](#), with no entry for Graham Sheppard; along with [8th November](#) and [6th November](#), even though A4 Hire is closed at weekends). This yet again can only have been part of faked records, despite Paul Folland's attempts to explain it. Note that he did not submit a formal witness statement or attend Court. It was all designed to discredit Ian and the most obvious tampered-with evidence, the original mower records.

However, the date they claimed Graham had hired it had changed from 10th November to a three-day period 6-8th November, eventually. But while Ian was in New York running the Marathon on Sunday 7th November, Nicola (with her great memory) had recalled that Graham and Margaret flew to [Dublin](#) on Monday 8th (this was on Flybe's Monday morning flight from Exeter).

Ian accepted that Graham and/or Margaret had been at Inkpen for the weekend before that (6-7 November) due to a bank statement entry on 6th at the Plume pub in Hungerford, but this did not fit with the A4 Hire record book he eventually got to see, after many months (showing the hiring on 6th and 8th November, 1 day each, but

Graham and Margaret weren't there on 8th – and Paul Folland's claim that the entry was the collection rang rather hollow given to get the morning flight from Exeter they almost certainly drove back on the Sunday evening to Teignmouth).

The judge ignored how incredibly late all these supposed records had been disclosed to Ian. He also ignored the [medical records](#) showing there was no way Graham would ever mow grass in cold, damp November conditions – he was at considerable health risk if he caught a virus (he's had his spleen removed, had a swollen liver, and was having blood transfusions every few weeks). In addition, the conditions were such that cutting long grass in the wet would have quickly clogged the mower up.

Ian complained to [Denise Gaines](#) about the inaccuracies in the material but received no reply, and Paul Folland of A4 Hire had become impossible to speak to as well. All the material came via Margaret and her solicitor, Richard Walford.

The night of the trial, Ian looked up [Nicholas Warren QC](#) and found that he is a very close contemporary of Margaret's relative, who she knows well and had mentioned on several occasions to Ian in the past: [Gerald Barling QC](#) (in the context of Margaret researching the Barling family tree – she had mentioned to Ian he lived in Kidderminster). He just happened to have taken a job at the Competition Appeal Tribunal at the RCJ that year. [The two judges](#) were chairs of CAT, went to Oxford together, and were even called to the Bar on the same day as benchers at Middle Temple. And they have been on the same side in at least one major case.

Suddenly there was a possible explanation for comments at the end of a letter sent to Ian by his aunt (Graham's sister) [Carol Eden](#), who alluded to "people you wouldn't imagine" helping Margaret. Carol, who died in 2016, lived in Malvern, not far from Kidderminster, and Margaret often visited Carol and her husband Charlie both before and after Graham died. In fact, their son Marcus (Eden), Ian's cousin, was always supportive of Ian and the unfair treatment he had received. (Note Paul Folland and his wife until 2016 owned a holiday home in [Cleobury Mortimer](#), near Kidderminster, just a mile or so from where Gerald Barling lives – something that wouldn't have been lost on Margaret).

That this was not a fair trial is a fact that seems to have been lost on the legal system, and even the Court of Appeal would not entertain allowing an appeal by Ian. Covering up for their friends? One suspects so.... though technically they were entitled to trust [Judge Warren](#), and ignored the issue of him completely ignoring the ethical code of conduct let alone the right to a fair trial enshrined in the Human Rights Act.

COURT ORDER: NEVER ACTED UPON – WHY?

Soon a copy of the High Court [Order](#) was received by Ian. It was also sent to Margaret's solicitors and Richard Sheppard. This revoked the will of 2nd August 2005 and replaced it with the 2004 will; said that Ian should pay the other side's costs (they have never pursued this – perhaps concerned Ian will do what he's doing now – expose their criminality, though Ian has always been concerned about acting until the revelations

about Richard Walford's unethical conduct and SRA fine); and Leave to Appeal was refused.

21st April 2009: [Ian objection to the Land Registry](#) removing Notice from the Title of [Hunters Way](#) preventing it from being sold. The property was sold on 17th September 2009 for £661,661.

4th December 2015. [Ian e-mail to a friend](#) in Devon (who he rented a room from when doing CPL at Exeter Airport) reflecting on the case.

Many years pass after Ian completed his own legal studies but he carried on as an aviation journalist/editor and flying instructor. Ian discovered at some point much later that the 2005 will remained in place, as Margaret wanted but not as Ian wanted, as without an agreement there should be an intestacy (ignoring the lies and corruption and lack of democratic process that established the 2004 will as the replacement).

DODGY SOLICITOR

In mid-2024 Ian Sheppard became aware that Richard Walford, Margaret's solicitor, has been heavily fined for misconduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA), but not struck off. Ian realises at last there was a crack that could convince people that Walford had knowingly helped Margaret push a fake case through the High Court.

Ian had been aware things had become rather tense at one point for Margaret and her brother Chris, but they'd found a way through with the help of a member of their wider family who was a senior judge. If this isn't the very definition of corruption, what is?

Walford had wrongly believed Ian would give up, be forced to settle on Margaret's terms, or run out of money – but he acted in person, giving up his own solicitor and barrister who had rapidly drained his funds. They got caught out, but nobody has done anything about it. Yet.

Sadly, Graham Sheppard died intestate, with no valid will. That's the truth, no matter how much false evidence and lies Margaret creates to try to resist it. Yet in the months following the trial, the will of 2nd August 2005 was left in place – the one that was admitted to be invalid.

The case was all about the will of 12th October 2004 with the will of 2nd August 2005 having been accepted as invalid in Court several times.

12th October 2024. Anniversary of Graham going to Hunters Way, Inkpen, near Hungerford while Margaret stayed in Teignmouth.

24th August 2025: 20th Anniversary of Graham's death at the age of 62. Ian had an excellent relationship with his father and with Margaret and had discussed his father's wills on several occasions with them. What got Ian was the lying after Graham died, and he always fought for the truth on the basis that it was the starting point, and nothing else

would be acceptable. Unfortunately, Ian believes Margaret was long convinced, and possibly still is, that Ian was lying about visiting his father at Hersham that day. This is puzzling but perhaps Graham simply forgot to mention it – or she simply forgot. Or she was lying about not recalling it, although she may not have initially.

Thus Ian had first-hand knowledge of his father's whereabouts on 12th October 2004 as he sat and had a cup of tea with him and Uncle Norrie (who sadly died in 2006). Crucially, the fake evidence sent initially by Richard Walford came before Ian had fully divulged the details of his visit to his father at Norrie's on 12th October 2004, but Ian had already established this and was piecing together the chain of events around it without a diary, anchored in time by Nicola's initial recollections. The slight delay in Ian fully backing up his accusations that his father had died intestate had given Margaret and her solicitor Richard Walford the confidence that placing Graham with her on 11-12th October would soon see Ian off – relying on the false assumption that he had no first-hand knowledge of events.

THE FAKE EVIDENCE MACHINE

The fact was that Ian was up against the fake evidence-making machine that was Margaret (assisted by the likes of Paul Folland of A4 Hire), with the solicitor that facilitated the delays that allowed her to create more fake evidence as and when required, and a 'friend of her family' judge who just waived it all through, having colluded with Margaret's barrister – there's no other way the judge could have produced that judgment so quickly when all Ian did is go across the road to St Clement Danes for an hour or so, awaiting the judgment. He was very much aware when he came back to the Courtroom that the two had been conferring when really the judge should have independently gone and considered the evidence, in a balanced manner.

Ultimately Margaret had no real evidence, only lies and fabricated evidence. And a lawyer who knew it was lies but pretended not to. In fact, Ian believes it was Richard Walford that gave Margaret the green light to present the fake case, then to keep on in the same unethical way with the cover-up. Ian had always got on very well with Margaret but her lying was a sharp turning point in their relationship. Ian had made no secret in the past that he hated lying and so had Nicola.

Finally, it should be noted that Ian passed a [sophisticated lie-detector test](#) to show he was telling the truth. Margaret declined to take one.

He tried to [complain](#) about all this at the time but to no avail, and concluded that the RCJ etc simply didn't have a comprehensive complaints handling mechanism in place at the time (it remains to be seen whether this has improved). Leave to Appeal was denied as there was no point of law and the Court deemed the question of fact settled by Warren J. Ian wrote to the [Appeals section at the RCJ](#) on 9th January 2009.

The [Order from the Court of Appeal](#) of 20th February 2009 was by [Sir John Chadwick](#) who by then was a retired judge, retiring from the Court of Appeal in 2007! Back to help is friends out, one suspects! Because he said Warren J was entitled to rely on the evidence of Tom Barling and 'Miss Bacon' but of course the latter was not even

there, although both judges seem to have ignored that obvious point, and that the defendants went to great lengths to allow Tom Barling not to appear to lie under oath.

Margaret's solicitor Richard Walford managed to persuade Paul Folland to put his signature to a [wholly insulting letter](#) to include in the CoA bundle. Ian never used any devious means, Denise Gaines simply sent the records and then Paul was clearly not happy about that later, and spent a lot of time and effort trying to help Margaret cover up the truth.

Ian never used any threatening language so that's simply put in for effect, and is a lie, and the written log was clearly faked (by Paul or Margaret). Margaret and Graham flew to Dublin from Exeter on the Monday morning (8th November) on Flybe, not on Tuesday 9th as they've tried to make out. There was no Tuesday flight. Ian has evidence they flew out on the 10.15am flight and they stayed at the [Drury Hotel](#). This is possibly the reason they said later it was hired for a three-day period, 6-8 November (8th Nov. being in the A4 Hire 'book') but A4 Hire is closed at weekends so there would have been no booking sheet for Saturday 6th November.

In addition, Ian established clearly that the date on the old version of the Hiremate software they were then using could be edited (changing 11/10 to 10/11); and it was ridiculous for Paul Folland to suggest he'd not met Margaret for years until 1st August 2008.

That the mower records should have read 11/10 rather than 10/11 is underlined by one final key point. Paul Folland said implicitly that the 10/11 date was when the account was settled, in an attempt to suggest the cost could have been incurred on 6th or 8th, or for a range of dates 6-8 November as the fake invoice shows. Yet it is clear from [Hiremate record for Graham's account](#) that Code 4000 means expense incurred (i.e. equipment hired) while Code 1200 is the Sales Receipt (as is the case for the two transactions above it). It was impossible for the 'order' to occur on 10/11 as Graham was in Dublin, so at the very least it is clear that Paul Folland was going against what his account system stated by saying the hire cost was incurred a few days before 10th November. It should have read 11/10, as Ian has said all along. If there had been an expense incurred on 6/11/2004 or 8/11/2004, why was there no line to reflect this on Graham's account?

Despite Paul Folland's claims that the date could not have been changed, Ian established from Advatech that it could be at the time, before they'd exported the data to SAGE; and separately a chartered accountant who examined the records said that given the two entries above that in question had been transposed (so were out of sequence) suggested entries could be edited on the old system.

Ian's recollection is certain; Graham said during their meeting on 12th October 2004 that he'd hired a tractor-mower at Inkpen. This is an immutable memory, no matter how much (very late) fake evidence they throw at it. That he couldn't sit down for long due to doing this, in the context of recovering from operations to remove abscesses that summer (when he almost died) was also part of that memory, that came back once the whole context of the day (and what day it was) was clear.

28th January 2025: Ian heard from STEP that they were not going to investigate fully Richard Walford as they accepted the findings of the SRA and the Court. Ian pointed out that the SRA had declined to look at the evidence in this article, and that the Court judgement could not be relied on due to the close association of the two aforementioned judges. STEP has yet to reply and deems the matter to be closed, although Ian believes that their complaints manager Lucy is extremely uncomfortable with Richard Walford being let off the hook so easily.

Compiled by Ian Sheppard, last updated 26 March 2025.

To contact Ian please e-mail ianrsheppard@yahoo.co.uk or call 07759 455770.

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

[**Skeleton Argument, Emily Campbell**](#)

[**Particulars of Claim by Emily Campbell \(Barrister for Ian\)**](#)

[**Ian Sheppard Witness Statement of 8th August 2008**](#)

[**Chronology of Mower Records**](#)

[**Graham Medical Report 2004 - 30th June**](#)

[**Transcript of Ian's Diary Page for 12th October**](#)