

From: FOI
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FOI 132/18 - Overspend by "Remain" campaign - Response
Date: 26 September 2018 10:44:01
Attachments: [FOI 13218 - Overspend by "Remain" campaign.pdf](#)

Dear [REDACTED],

Our Ref: FOI 132/18

Thank you for your email to the Electoral Commission dated **09 August 2018**.

The Commission aims to respond to requests for information promptly and regrets that on this occasion we have not done so.

Your request is in bold below followed by our response.

- 1. A copy of all correspondence (including emails) between 3 June 2018– 3 August 2018, sent by one of the following - - Claire Bassett, Ailsa Irvine, Bob Poser, Louise Edwards, Louise Footner or Tom Hawthorn - - which refer to claims of possible overspending by ‘Remain’ campaign groups.**

Our response is as follows:

We hold the information you have requested and have attached the relevant correspondence to this response.

Exemptions under section 40(2) Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA)

You will notice that certain personal details have been redacted from the documents we are releasing. Section 40(2) provides exemption where the information requested constitutes personal data as defined by the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA), and where release of the information requests would breach one of the data protection principles. Some of the information contained in the requested information falls within the description of personal data as defined by Part 1 of the DPA because the information relates directly to an identifiable living individual. This includes names and contact details of individuals in some instances.

I trust that this information satisfies your request. The Commission strives to be an open, transparent authority, but in some circumstances we cannot responsibly release requested information, and we ask for your understanding in this regard.

If you are not satisfied with this response, please note that the Commission operates a review procedure, details of which can be found on the Commission website at: <http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/about-us/freedom-of-information-requests/how-do-i-make-an-foi-request>

Please also note that if you have exhausted all internal Commission review procedures and you are still not satisfied you have the right to appeal to the Information Commissioner. Details of this procedure can be found on the ICO website: <https://ico.org.uk/>

Yours sincerely,



Access to Information Officer (FOI and DPA)

The Electoral Commission

FOI@electoralcommission.org.uk

electoralcommission.org.uk

From: [Louise Edwards](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
Date: 31 July 2018 15:26:02

Hi

I reworked the Priti Patel letter. Can you have a quick look through on the link below and let me know if you're happy it's an accurate reflection of your assessment decision please?

Thanks

From: Bob Posner
Sent: 31 July 2018 14:32
To: Louise Edwards
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
Yes fine, thanks.
Bob.

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 14:24
To: Bob Posner [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: FW: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
Claire is happy. Are you happy?
thanks

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 14:09
To: Claire Bassett [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/_layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2187
Does this work? I've highlighted the paragraphs I've changed. The Stronger In one in particular is tricky, because what we are basically saying is that there just isn't anything we can see beyond simple speculation.

From: Claire Bassett
Sent: 31 July 2018 13:19
To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
thanks

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 13:17
To: Claire Bassett [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Cc: Bob Posner [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>; Craig Westwood [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners

Hi

She sent three in total. Not sure that you have access to the enforcement files so I've attached them.

Thanks

From: Claire Bassett
Sent: 31 July 2018 12:44
To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>

Cc: Bob Posner [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; Craig Westwood [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners

Thanks

Please can I see Priti Patel's letter to us too?

From: Louise Edwards

Sent: 31 July 2018 12:21

To: Claire Bassett [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Cc: Bob Posner [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; Craig Westwood [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: FW: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners

Hi Claire

Below are links to the letters to Priti Patel and to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Bob and Craig, and others, have commented. I'd welcome any comments you have.

We are ready to go with the letters to the two campaigners we will investigate. We are primed to send those letters shortly before we publish these ones.

Thanks

Louise

From: Louise Edwards

Sent: 30 July 2018 06:52

To: Bob Posner [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; Craig Westwood [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners

Hi both

http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/_layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2187

http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/_layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2189

Attached are links to two letters:

- One to Priti Patel about her complaint about 'remain' campaigners. You will see that we are not going to investigate Stronger In, or any of the allegations of them coordinating with campaigners that registered late in the campaign. But we are going to investigate two smaller campaigners for possible undeclared joint spending.
- One to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] about the [REDACTED] programme, in which we decline to investigate the various allegations made.

[REDACTED] can point you to the incoming letters if you want to see them. Both sets of complaints have been assessed. These are basically the letters to the complainants. We talked about publishing them, possibly together. If you had any thoughts on the letters themselves please let me know. Otherwise, does it make sense to aim to publish these at some point this week?

Note that [REDACTED] will need to have written to the two campaigners under investigation first.

Thanks

Louise

Louise Edwards

Head of Regulation

The Electoral Commission
3 Bunhill Row
London EC1Y 8YZ
020 7271 [REDACTED]
electoralcommission.org.uk
yourvotematters.co.uk
[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Blog](#)

From: [Bob Posner](#)
To: [Louise Edwards](#)
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
Date: 31 July 2018 14:31:34

Yes fine, thanks.
[Bob.](#)

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 14:24
To: Bob Posner
Subject: FW: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
[Claire is happy. Are you happy?](#)
[thanks](#)

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 14:09
To: Claire Bassett [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/_layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2187
Does this work? I've highlighted the paragraphs I've changed. The Stronger In one in particular is tricky, because what we are basically saying is that there just isn't anything we can see beyond simple speculation.

From: Claire Bassett
Sent: 31 July 2018 13:19
To: Louise Edwards <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
[thanks](#)

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 13:17
To: Claire Bassett [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Cc: Bob Posner [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>; Craig Westwood [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners

Hi
[She sent three in total. Not sure that you have access to the enforcement files so I've attached them.](#)
[Thanks](#)

From: Claire Bassett
Sent: 31 July 2018 12:44
To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Cc: Bob Posner [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>; Craig Westwood <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners
[Thanks](#)

[Please can I see Priti Patel's letter to us too?](#)

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 31 July 2018 12:21
To: Claire Bassett [REDACTED] [@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>

Cc: Bob Posner <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; Craig Westwood <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: FW: Priti Patel and BBC complaints about campaigners

Hi Claire

Below are links to the letters to Priti Patel and to [REDACTED] Bob and Craig, and others, have commented. I'd welcome any comments you have.

We are ready to go with the letters to the two campaigners we will investigate. We are primed to send those letters shortly before we publish these ones.

Thanks

Louise

From: Louise Edwards

Sent: 30 July 2018 06:52

To: Bob Posner <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; Craig Westwood <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: Priti Patel and [REDACTED] complaints about campaigners

Hi both

http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/_layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2187

http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/_layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2189

Attached are links to two letters:

- One to Priti Patel about her complaint about 'remain' campaigners. You will see that we are not going to investigate Stronger In, or any of the allegations of them coordinating with campaigners that registered late in the campaign. But we are going to investigate two smaller campaigners for possible undeclared joint spending.
- One to [REDACTED] about the [REDACTED] in which we decline to investigate the various allegations made.

[REDACTED] can point you to the incoming letters if you want to see them. Both sets of complaints have been assessed. These are basically the letters to the complainants. We talked about publishing them, possibly together. If you had any thoughts on the letters themselves please let me know. Otherwise, does it make sense to aim to publish these at some point this week?

Note that [REDACTED] will need to have written to the two campaigners under investigation first.

Thanks

Louise

Louise Edwards

Head of Regulation

The Electoral Commission

3 Bunhill Row

London EC1Y 8YZ

020 7271 [REDACTED]

electoralcommission.org.uk

yourvotematters.co.uk

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Blog](#)

From: [Louise Edwards](#)
To: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response
Date: 25 July 2018 08:06:41

Thanks [REDACTED]. In terms of the letter I'm writing then, are you happy for me to tell her that both DDB and WAAV are subjects of the investigation?

Louise

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2018 12:14
To: Louise Edwards ; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response

Hi Louise,

[REDACTED] has double checked and confirmed as below.

DDBUK – submitted on PEF Online and no joint spending reported.

WAAV – submitted on PEF Online and no joint spending reported

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2018 11:14
To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk); [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response

Hi

Yes, agreed.

I had checked these documents [DDB's spending return](#) , [WAAV spending return](#), both downloaded from our public website. I've just looked in this [folder](#) for the actual returns but neither is there. I'm happy to come in tomorrow to check.

From: Louise Edwards
Sent: 24 July 2018 10:44
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>; [REDACTED]
<[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response

And must be declared iaw EURA Sch1 para 23, [REDACTED]. I assume you have checked the DDB and WAAV returns for any declared joint spending? I don't believe you can tell from PFR Online so you would need to look at the actual returns.

Thanks

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 July 2018 10:21
To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED] [\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk); [REDACTED]
<[\[REDACTED\]@electoralcommission.org.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk)>
Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response

Hi

My reading of EURA schedule 1 para 22(3) is that it deems that 'common plan expenses' are taken into account when calculating the thresholds under s.117 PPERA and s.118 PPERA, rather than imposing an obligation to report them. So 'common plan expenses' need to be taken into account in terms of the

obligation to register as a permitted participant (s.117 PPERA), i.e. the £10,000 threshold, and in terms of the spending limits on permitted participants during the referendum period (s.118 PPERA).

From: Louise Edwards

Sent: 24 July 2018 09:45

To: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response

Hi

Re your comment. If both DDB and WAAV incurred spending on the videos then both need to declare the spending of the other as well as their own. Neither did. Both are under investigation. See EURA schedule 1 para 22(3).

Is that not right?

Thanks

Louise

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 July 2018 08:33

To: Louise Edwards [REDACTED]s@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: RE: Priti Patel complaint response

Hi,

Louise, yes apart from one suggested amendment in the concluding para.

From: Louise Edwards

Sent: 24 July 2018 08:06

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED]

<[REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>;

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]@electoralcommission.org.uk>

Subject: Priti Patel complaint response

<http://skynet/dm/Functions/CaseworkInvestigations/layouts/15/DocIdRedir.aspx?ID=TX6SW6SUV4E4-1668264703-2187>

Hi all

Above is my draft response to Priti Patel's complaint about various remain campaigners.

[REDACTED] – Does this accurately reflect your assessment conclusions? I've used the assessment to draft it, so hopefully it does.

[REDACTED] – You will note that we are going to investigate one element. Do you have any comments on the drafting itself, particularly that section around our impartiality? Are you happy with the offer of a meeting (we made the same offer in my last letter but she didn't take us up)?

Given the profile of the letter I'm also going to ask Craig (and Bob if it slips to next week) to review it. But I'd welcome your comments first. By, say, close tomorrow?

Thanks and happy to discuss.

Louise

Louise Edwards

Head of Regulation

The Electoral Commission

3 Bunhill Row
London EC1Y 8YZ
020 7271 [REDACTED]
electoralcommission.org.uk
yourvotematters.co.uk
[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Blog](#)

From: [Louise Edwards](#)
To: [FOI](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: FOI 104/18 - Vote Remain campaign - Acknowledgement
Date: 10 July 2018 07:32:55

Hi

I wonder if this is really appropriate to take forward under the FOI process? The request is not for information as such, but for the Commission to confirm or deny an allegation and a request for us to investigate. It seems to me that we can better answer the question in that way, rather than searching for documents that we are then likely to exempt.

If you agree, please could you forward the email to the PFR Inbox and we will take it from there.

Happy to discuss.

Thanks

Louise

From: FOI
Sent: 09 July 2018 10:40
To: Louise Edwards
Subject: FOI 104/18 - Vote Remain campaign - Acknowledgement
Dear Louise,

Our Ref: FOI 104/18

The Commission has received the following FOI request:

1. In the month before the vote the Remainers set up five new campaigns and funnelled a million pounds into them so they could stay under the spending limit: I would like to know if this is correct & if so, would like the Electoral Commission to investigate whether the EU Remain Campaign broke its spending limits & will be subject to the same scrutiny of the Vote Leave Campaign.
 - a. [DDB UK LTD](#) registered as an independent campaign on 25 May 2016, less than a month before the referendum. DDB UK Ltd received £191,000 in donations.
 - b. [Best For Our Future](#) registered as a permitted participant on the 27 May 2016, less than a month before the referendum. It received £424,000 in donations.
 - c. [The In Crowd](#) registered on 10 June 2016, less than two weeks before the referendum. It received £76,000 in donations
 - d. [Virgin Management Ltd](#) registered as a permitted participant on 3 June 2016, less than three weeks before the referendum. It received £210,000 in donations.
 - e. [Wake Up and Vote](#) registered as a permitted participant on 24 May 2016, less than a month before the referendum. It received £100,000 in donations.

For information, here is a link to the [FOI Internal Procedure](#)

You have been identified as the MT member responsible for preparing the response and ensuring that it is sent out to the requester as soon as possible and

within the 20 working days statutory deadline for FOI requests. For this request the 20 working day deadline falls on **02 August 2018** but we should aim to get the response out in advance of that date if possible.

If you are not the right MT member to lead on this request, it is your responsibility to pass on the request to that person as a matter of urgency.

Please update the FOI log every Friday with details of the progress in responding to the request. This should include the risk level and who is involved in preparing the response.

- If Third Party consultation is required, please ensure that this is done at the earliest opportunity, preferably by the end of day 3. This will ensure little hold up in made in preparing the response.
- If you decide that this FOI is deemed high risk, please inform me as soon as possible so that we can plan a realistic schedule to meet the deadline.

Please insert your answer to the request into this relevant

Once the draft has been completed, and approved if it is a higher risk request, please send it to the Information Management team who will send the response out to the requester.

All emails and documents that need to be retained as a record of the Commission's actions in responding to the request should be stored in this folder: Skynet/DM/Functions/Information Management/FOI DPA Requests/

As MT lead for this request, is your responsibility to ensure that they are there ready for review in the event of a request for internal review of an FOI response, or a request for information from the Information Commissioner's Office.

Please get back to me with any questions.

Kind regards,

From: [Louise Edwards](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Decision To Fine Vote Leave
Date: 18 July 2018 09:45:21

Hi

No problem.

I think that it would be helpful to make a broader point somewhere in your reply that we have an Enforcement Policy that sets out our approach, process and investigative powers. All our investigations are conducted in line with this published policy.

On point 1, please refer [REDACTED] to our published investigation report. This sets out in detail the key events of the investigation. This includes our interaction with Vote Leave during the investigation. It also explains the breadth of evidence we obtained and analysed to make our conclusions. He will see that this evidence came from a number of sources including Vote Leave itself.

<https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/journalist/electoral-commission-media-centre/news-releases/donations/vote-leave-fined-and-referred-to-the-police-for-breaking-electoral-law>

On point 2, please refer [REDACTED] to the Enforcement Policy, chapter 6, which explains how we work with other regulators including the police. And again, the published report in respect of Vote Leave, as this explains why we decided to refer individuals to the police in this instance.

Hope this helps.

Louise

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 July 2018 13:17
To: Louise Edwards
Subject: FW: Decision To Fine Vote Leave

Hello,

Terribly sorry to have to bother you with this but [REDACTED] tells me I will have to ask you about points 1 and 2 below. Would you be so kind as to help?

Many thanks

[REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 17 July 2018 12:21
To: Complaints <Complaints@electoralcommission.org.uk>
Subject: Decision To Fine Vote Leave

Morning,

I am writing to complain about the very clearly biased actions of the so called Electoral Commission in the decision to fine Vote Leave £61,000 and also, inform the Police. Unsurprisingly the Commission is loaded with Pro EU careerists who despite clear evidence that Remain was supported by significantly more funds including a (unauthorised by the public) £9M government leaflet, it does not feel the need to fully investigate Remain. What utter hypocrisy and collusion.

Remain campaign did exactly the same thing that Vote Leave is accused of, only far, far worse. In the month before the vote the Remainers set up **FIVE** new campaigns and funnelled a **MILLION** pounds into them so they could stay under the spending limit:

- [DDB UK Ltd](#) registered as an independent campaign on 25 May 2016, less than a month before the referendum. DDB UK Ltd received £191,000 in donations.
- [Best For Our Future](#) registered as a permitted participant on 27 May 2016, less than a month

before the referendum. It received £424,000 in donations

- [The In Crowd](#) registered on 10 June 2016, less than two weeks before the referendum. It received £76,000 in donations.
- [Virgin Management Ltd](#) registered as a permitted participant on 3 June 2016, less than three weeks before the referendum. It received £210,000 in donations.
- [Wake Up And Vote](#) registered as a permitted participant on 24 May 2016, less than a month before the referendum. It received £100,000 in donations.

The Remain campaign did exactly the same thing as Vote Leave, only with more money and with five new campaigns.

In the circumstances:

1. *Please make available your evidence that Vote Leave refused to cooperate with the Commission*
2. *Why does this commission feel it necessary to inform the Police yet when the Liberal Democrats were fined £18,000 for breaching spending rules in the EU referendum, yet the Police were not informed?*
3. *Why does the commission feel that the £9M public money used by the government to promote Remain is not a breach of spending rules?*
4. *Please provide evidence that the allegations into Remain using the same tactics have been fully investigated and reasons why no further action is deemed necessary*

It is obvious to over 17.4M people what the Commission's agenda is here and it's actions both professionally and privately will not be forgotten by the public. The reputation of democracy and various so called unbiased organisations within the UK is under scrutiny like never before.

Announcements like today from the Commission, clearly based on one sided whistle blowing and to a staunchly Pro EU panel, merely highlights how little the public trust them any longer.

For what it's worth I look forward to hearing from you before no doubt having to take my complaint further to the PHSO.

Yours sincerely



From: [Bob Posner](#)
To: ["Office of Priti Patel"](#)
Subject: RE: (Case Ref: ZA49048)
Date: 04 June 2018 08:26:32

Thank you for your email with attachment. It will be considered alongside the earlier letter and we will respond formally in due course.

Yours sincerely

Bob Posner

Director of Political Finance and Regulation & Legal Counsel

The Electoral Commission

3 Bunhill Row

London EC1Y 8YZ

Tel: 020 7271 [REDACTED]

www.electoralcommission.org.uk

From: Office of Priti Patel

Sent: 03 June 2018 11:28

To: Bob Posner

Subject: FW: (Case Ref: ZA49048)

Dear Mr Posner,

Please find attached a letter to the Electoral Commission from The Rt Hon Priti Patel MP.

Yours sincerely,

Office of The Rt Hon Priti Patel MP
Member of Parliament for Witham