

**Subject:** Re: OPEN LETTER – Offer of Mediation  
**From:** "Jason Earl, JET" <jason.earl@thejetgroup.co.uk>  
**Date:** 05/11/2019, 11:53  
**To:** Chandrakant Patel <chandrakantpatel1951@outlook.com>, "patrick.tedstone@orj.co.uk" <patrick.tedstone@orj.co.uk>  
**CC:** "rpawilliams@g-cv.com" <rpawilliams@g-cv.com>, "fieldhouse@ntlworld.com" <fieldhouse@ntlworld.com>, "albie@versaaccountants.co.uk" <albie@versaaccountants.co.uk>

Mr Tedstone,

I will have to politely decline this call in new few minutes. There is no point me being on it unless both the Patel and Busfield families are on it.

Following the conduct of the call on Sunday night which I tried to take in good faith in the hope it was going to provide resoltion both parties. Instead I was misguided away from the IT matters and misguided and threatened into an ulterior agenda. If we are dealing with a stakeholder dispute, then it must be done in such a way it holds and represents all stakeholders interests interests and objectives. For this reason I also believe an independent mediator based in London is the way forward. I am aware Mr Turner and Mr Hayward have made similar suggestions in the past informally (ie. verbally on calls)

Your client agreed to the idea of paying me without surrendering company codes that might enable your client to further annex company assets from stakeholders on my call on Fri. There was a unanimous agreement that disbursements should have been paid. Your client has broken their own agreement. Therefore it can be deducted your client (who we now know is George given he was on the call speaking to you on Sunday) simply has no intention of paying me and simply is being vindictive (See "Ranvir Singh Contact email").

I keep stressing that my pay dispute and stakeholder matters must be handled independently. It can be clearly highlighted that over that I have gone beyond what is needed to keep systems running despite my lack of pay.

Jase

On 05/11/2019 07:47, Chandrakant Patel wrote:

Dear Mr Tedstone.

Thank you for your email dated 03/11/2019 (the "**3<sup>rd</sup> November Email**").

I am not sure who your client is and would appreciate clarification. From previous correspondence including your 3<sup>rd</sup> November Email, it would appear that you represent Adam Voce, George Busfield and Cynthia Busfield; I shall, for the purpose of this letter, refer to them as "your Client".

I refute absolutely all of the allegations made by you (and/or by your client) whether explicit, implicit or implied in your 3<sup>rd</sup> November Email and in other correspondence. My son Mehul would likewise refute any such allegations. You do not offer up any evidence in support of your allegations other than a "hunch" based on a couple of phone calls on a Sunday evening with an inexperienced company director (and whom I presume was not legally represented on the call??).

I have, and my son on my behalf has, been dealing with your Client for many years now. I appreciate that you are new to this situation and may therefore not have full visibility of the facts nor of the historical actions and strategies of certain stakeholders (including your Client).

In my experience and as can be shown by evidence, certain stakeholders have acted in their own self-interest and I believe have appropriated funds bound for JET Group Services, JET Group and other related companies; indeed, I understand that the companies and certain other stakeholders of the group generally are currently being investigated by HMRC. I am sure that if, by way of example, you ask your Client for any recent correspondence with HMRC you will be enlightened as to these historical actions and strategies employed by the companies and certain stakeholders.

With this in mind, I do not wish to engage in a conference call with you and/or your Client. Accordingly, I will not be available for a call on the 5<sup>th</sup> November as it will be a predetermined agenda by yourself, will not seek to resolve any of the outstanding issues and disputes in which I have an interest nor can I expect any agreed solutions to be honoured.

**I do however whole heartedly welcome mediation to resolve shareholder matters and we should work on an agenda and then agree whom to use as a mediator.** Please note however that this has been requested previously but been rejected outright by your Client.

In relation to your assertion that legal advice can be sought and obtained within 24 hours (of your 3<sup>rd</sup> November Email) in relation to the various allegations you have made in your 3<sup>rd</sup> November Email is disingenuous and presumably much less time than you yourself have had to consider such facts that have provided to you.

And proposing that mediation can be entered into on short notice is also unfair. I presume that you are not suggesting that, in lieu of proper considered advice, I simply agree to expedited mediation. Is this advice that your regulator would consider fair and just to a layperson (who is not currently legally represented)? Surely you would agree that, at the very least, I would require access to company documents including accounts to prepare for mediation?

You should appreciate that I am most interested in being given my entitled shareholding in the group; being 36.2% as is confirmed by your Client. Despite this confirmation, your Client is withholding and frustrating completion of my ownership of those shares. Associated with those shares are various other rights that I am entitled to such as, the ability to appoint or remove a director, dividends, voting rights in relation to direction of the group, financial accounts and other shareholder rights.

So, once again, I welcome mediation. As part of mediation I would suggest all stakeholders and/or their representatives be present; namely

Cynthia Busfield

George Busfield

Adam Voce

Chandrakant Patel

Mehul Patel

Matthew Cheung

Anthony Cheung

Jason Earl

Adam Linton

Aubrey Hayward

Yogesh Chandarama

Alec Baughan

I understand that many of the above, like myself, have been promised shares but those shares have not been delivered.

I would also suggest those that have been asked to be directors on behalf of your client George Busfield are asked to provide insight.

Adam Linton

Aubrey Hayward

Jason Earl

Alec Baughan.

Ivalyo Dimitrov

Richard Phillip Williams.

I think that we should do all we can to assist HMRC in its investigations in order to protect and preserve the business and assets of the group. As such, I would also suggest we invite Karen Pryse from HMRC to discuss the taxation affairs related to the company due to the questions she raises, as have I.

You will appreciate that I have written this letter as an "Open Letter". I have done so as it is my intention, should we proceed to a formal dispute mechanism, then I will present this letter to the Courts as evidence of my commitment to finding a mediated solution.

As I have explained many times previously to your Client, I also am open to finding alternative solutions. As you will no doubt learn (if you do not already know), I have put forward many possible solutions to you Client over the years and sadly, all of these have been rejected. I do remain hopeful however that we can find a workable solution.

Regards

Chandrakant Patel